The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 26, 1891.

The Week.

THE *Tribune's* announcement that "the public will be especially interested to find that the President expresses himself unreservedly against renewal of the agitation on the tariff or the silver question," has naturally produced a profound sensation. "Especially interested," indeed! Why, the public are thunderstruck. Extensive preparations have been made for this agitation. A large number of the leading newspapers are committed to its continuance. Clubs have been founded for that purpose, and considerable amounts invested in houses for their accommodation and in the production of documents for popular circulation. There is, too, behind these preparations a great deal of dissatisfaction with the McKinley Bill and alarm of one sort or another about the prospect of free coinage. There is also a widely diffused belief—perhaps a mistaken one, but none the less a fact—that the President is the people's servant; that it is for him to listen, for them to speak; that "agitation" is simply the popular name for discussion among his masters as to what he shall be directed to do or refrain from doing, and that one great use of agitation is to clear his mind as well as that of Congress on public questions. His prohibition of any more discussion on these subjects for the present is therefore a terrible blow to those who do not agree with him. Of course they were aware that they did not know as much about such questions as he does; that the cogitations on political economy and finance carried on in that Indianapolis law-office raised his intelligence far above that of the mass of his fellow-citizens; but they always thought that, although he might despise their prattle, he would let them prattle on. We shall still hope that this deliverance of his is not final. Delegations will, we are sure, shortly leave this city for Washington to remonstrate, respectfully, of course, with our ruler on the impolicy, demonstrated by centuries of human experience, of closing the public mouth in periods of great disturbance. Great minds, especially great Indiana minds, reach their conclusions *per saltum*, as it were, but ordinary people elsewhere have to chatter to each other a good deal before they can be sure they are right.

We wonder whether the President has ever read with comprehension section 25 of the McKinley Bill, which allows a drawback on the imported raw materials used in articles manufactured for export. That he has read it is apparent, for he told the correspondent of the *Tribune* in that immortal interview that

"Under this act the American merchant can get raw material, for the duty is not charged where such material is imported to be manufactured into articles for exportation, and so the American merchant will be able to sell at the same point of advantage as the English merchant, with the additional advantage of free entry into ports where treaties are made."

But has he read it with comprehension? We fear not, for it runs thus:

"That the imported materials used in the manufacture or production of articles entitled to drawback of customs duties when exported shall, in all cases where drawback of duties paid on such materials is claimed, *be identified, the quantity of such materials used and the amount of duties paid thereon shall be ascertained, the facts of the manufacture or production* of such articles in the United States and their exportation therefrom shall be determined, and the drawback due thereon shall be paid to the manufacturer, producer, or exporter, to the agent of either, or to the person to whom such manufacturer, producer, exporter, or agent shall in writing order such drawback paid, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe."

We are quite sure, if he had understood it and had talked to any manufacturer about it, he would have found out that no American would attempt to compete with British manufacturers in a product in which the free raw material would have to appear and be "identified" so that it could be weighed or measured by custom-house officers, with the risk of disallowance, of appeal to the courts, of endless affidavits, of charges of perjury, and of delays and annoyances of all kinds. Fancy, for instance, using a proportion of foreign wool in the carpet manufacture, and having to point out the particular threads of foreign origin, and swear to them, before he got his drawback. The venerable men who drafted this section, we suspect, knew well what they were about, but it is plain they did not let the President into their secret.

We are looking with much interest for the responses which Republicans of the land, in and out of the press, may make to the *Tribune's* second-term Harrison proclamation. Thus far, not only are there next to no favorable notices, but scarcely any notice whatever is to be found in the leading journals of the party. This is the more remarkable when we consider that the President has appointed something like twenty leading editors of the country to lucrative and honorable public office. With the creditable exception of the *Tribune*, not a single one of the journals whose editors have been so favored has had a word to say in approval of the second-term boom. This extraordinary silence ought to be explained by some one who understands it, which we are free to confess we do not, and we call upon the *Tribune* to enlighten us, and to rebuke its fellow-beneficiaries for their ungrateful conduct. Absolutely the only favorable notice that we have been able to discover after several days' examination of the newspaper mails, is one from a poor little paper in Poughkeepsie whose editor has only recently been made Postmaster. His gratitude has not yet had time to cool, and yet he is only able to say that he thinks time will convince everybody that the President is really and truly a great, big man and not "under-sized and insignificant," as his political enemies have represented. Here is the striking portion of the Postmaster's tribute: "It is altogether too early yet to talk of the nomination for 1892, and we do not speak of him as a probable or possible candidate then. But the people are recognizing his sterling worth, his greatness of mind, and his sound statesmanship, and we believe this feeling will increase greatly during the remainder of his term."

The Republican newspapers are naturally hugely delighted with Mr. Phelps's article on Blaine's diplomacy, and think that it makes a very good joke on the Mugwumps, which it undoubtedly does. We cannot recall any joke on anybody in politics quite so good of its kind. Mr. Phelps was about the last man from whom either Mugwumps or Democrats looked for an article defending Blaine's diplomacy, not on legal grounds, but on any grounds that came to hand. A teacher of law to young men at Yale College, too, was one of the last men from whom they looked for ridicule of arbitration, and commendation of war, as a means of settling international differences. And he was among the last Democrats by whom Mugwumps, who had opposed Blaine in 1884, and assisted to defeat him because they believed him personally dishonest, expected to be called on to certify to a foreign nation in 1889 that they believed him to be just and truthful in all his dealings, and an honorable and worthy and competent exponent of his country's rights in the forum of international diplomacy. The joke is the more enjoyable, too, because Mr. Phelps's article is the first defence of Mr. Blaine's diplomacy which has appeared anywhere. The journalistic endorsements of it as "superb," "overwhelming," and so forth, which have been put forth by the party organs, do not count. These organs have never pretended to have any knowledge or even opinion of their own about the Bering Sea question, and no Republican lawyer of standing or character has ventured to come to their aid. But they must not laugh too long, or crow too loudly, for they are already, in their glee, on the edge of an approval of Mr. Bayard's diplomacy as able and patriotic and shrewd, which, considering how they spoke of it when Mr. Blaine came in, would be very mortifying, if they did it inadvertently. They must therefore pull up short, and not make too much of Mr. Phelps. He is a dangerous man to handle, as he stands just now. He is by no means a "dead wire."

Senator Allison and ex-Representative Cannon have completed their statement of the appropriations made by the last Congress. The total for the two sessions foots up $988,000,000, but this does not include the direct-tax refund, amounting to upwards of $15,-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

000,000. If this is added, as it should be, to the other extravagances of the Fifty-first Congress, the sum reaches more than a thousand million dollars for two years, being an increase of $170,000,000 over the appropriations of the last Congress. The greater part of this increase is due to pension largesses by which modest and honest veterans have been tempted to join the greedy and the unscrupulous in a general rush on the Treasury, and to barter their fame for money. The increase in pension appropriations for the two years is $113,000,000, but this does not measure the real increase, since the examination of claims under the Dependent Pension Bill has only begun. Under this bill, as Gen. Alger triumphantly explained to the Grand Army men, it makes no difference whether the claimant is rich or poor. If he is unable to earn a living by manual labor, he has a good claim, and it rests largely with himself to decide whether he is able to do so or not.

The Italian Consul at New Orleans, Signor Corte, has made a statement about his countrymen in that city which we trust will receive due attention from the members of the late lynching party, because it opens up a really fruitful field of reform. He speaks with great justice of the enormous service rendered to the State by the large number of sober, hard-working, and, on the whole, well-behaved Italian laborers employed on the sugar and cotton plantations around New Orleans.

"But," he adds, "this does not exclude the fact that there are among them about a hundred criminals, escaped from Italian prisons, most of them long since naturalized as Americans, mixed up in the city and State politics, and caressed and protected by politicians, through whose support several have obtained important political places. Their especial occupation was to naturalize newly-arrived Italians here."

The truth is, we believe, that the Louisiana State law allows immigrants to vote at State elections as soon as they have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, or, in other words, it may be the day after they land, and there is a rush of politicians on board every emigrant vessel to secure votes as soon as she gets to the wharf. A more shocking state of things it would be difficult to imagine, and how the "good Americans" who broke open the jail the other day in order to get at the products of this iniquity, can have allowed it to exist all these years, it is difficult to comprehend. But it shows clearly that they are not the symmetrical, all-round reformers that the crisis calls for. Somebody in Boston has proposed, as a remedy for the evils of profuse immigration and reckless naturalization, the establishment of a "Professor of America" in every college, whose duty, we suppose, would be to brag about his country to his class. But this is not what is needed. Every man, or nearly every man, can do his own bragging, both about himself and his country. What is wanted is a Professor of the Sins, Negligences, and Ignorances of "good Americans," and among them the patience and good nature with which they submit to the rule of the "ignorant foreigner," and, indeed, the cheerfulness with which they accept it, if they think it will put them in the way of an office, however petty, or make a reduction in their taxes, or even relieve them of a little "bother." It is quite safe to say that there is not, in most of the States at least, a single evil or abuse usually attributed to immigration which is not due in the last analysis to native indifference, connivance, or cowardice.

The New Orleans jury is now undergoing the most thorough investigation. They all say they were not bribed, and the blame of the local press seems to fall mainly on Seligman, the foreman, who fled to Cincinnati on the day of the massacre. It appears that an affidavit touching Seligman's unfitness was sent to the District Attorney before the trial, and the District Attorney now says in an interview that when he received this affidavit the jury was already empanelled; that had it reached him sooner he would have excluded Seligman—an excuse which the *Daily Picayune* treats as flimsy. It says Seligman controlled the jury absolutely through his superior intelligence. The probabilities are, however, that if the jurymen shared, as they doubtless did share, the popular opinion about the Mafia, they acquitted the prisoners from sheer terror. No juryman will stand up against the fear of assassination. The reasonable assurance that his death will, if he falls, be terribly avenged, does not under such circumstances console either the ordinary man or his family. This is the experience of all nations and races. He wants to live and carry on business at the old stand, and thinks murderers ought to be pursued and punished, as the California Sheriff said, "by the darned fellows they murder."

We learn from the *American Manufacturer and Iron World* of Pittsburgh that the plate-glass manufacturers have called the attention of the Treasury Department to the fact that they are about to open 390 new works or pots, and that there are not enough skilled laborers in the country to operate them. What the Treasury Department is going to do about it is not stated. Perhaps it will be asked to issue an order for 1,500 first-rate glass-workers and assign them to the Diamond Plate Glass Company, the Charleroi Plate Glass Company, the Ford City Glass Company, etc., etc. The Treasury Department has been charged with the duty of executing the Alien Contract Labor Law, not of violating it or winking at its violation. We cannot see any reason why these highly protected manufacturers should apply to the Treasury Department for foreign laborers, any more than why buyers of plate glass should apply to the same department for a remission of the duties, which amount to 141 per cent. ad valorem on the larger sizes of plate. The plate-glass business is combined in the form of a Trust, or something very closely resembling it, and the profits of the business are such that those who carry it on ought to be able to take care of themselves without any more help from the Government than they are already receiving.

The *Financial Chronicle* calls attention to the fact that the country is now shipping gold abroad where it would be shipping silver but for the senseless law, passed last year, increasing the Government's purchases of the latter metal to 4,500,000 ounces per month. This result was pointed out by the *Evening Post* at the time when the new Silver Act was passed. It is a mathematical formula that if we produce 54,000,000 ounces of silver per year and export one-half of it, we can retain an equal amount, say $27,000,000, of gold or of other things at gold value. But if the Government buys and locks up the whole amount, we must send abroad $27,000,000 more than we otherwise should of gold or other equivalent goods. In order to avoid sending gold, we must put down the price of the other goods in order to induce foreigners to take them instead of the gold. In short, the Silver Bill of last year is a bill to depress the prices of all exportable commodities except the precious metals. The deluded farmers and planters who urged the passage of that bill are now paying the cost of it in lower prices for wheat and cotton.

The opinion seems to be held in some influential quarters that the action of the Treasury Department in refusing to furnish gold bars for export will cause more gold to be exported than would otherwise be taken at this time. The implication is, that some people's nerves will be so affected that they will jump into the gold-exporting business regardless of expense, and send out the yellow metal even though the rate of exchange would not reimburse them. We can see not the slightest evidence of such a tendency. The truth is that the United States is the only country, we believe, that has ever put upon its statute-book a provision authorizing its Treasury officers to pay out something better than its own standard coin. Our act of May 26, 1882, went further than that: it not only authorized but required this. The authorization still continues. The Treasury can give bars for coin if it chooses to do so. It can charge something for the exchange if it chooses to do so. The object of the law originally was to take away from exporters any motive for "picking and choosing" among the various gold coins coming into their hands—selecting those of full weight or a trifle over weight to send abroad, and leaving the lighter ones at home. This was the *raison d'être* of the law, and it had no other. In this view it was a wise provision, but the exercise of the discretion conferred by it must be left to the Department. There is no reason to suppose that it has been erroneously exercised in the present instance.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A very interesting struggle is in progress in Boston, growing out of the efforts of Gov. Russell to expel "politics" from the police administration of the city. In 1886 the Republican managers of the party in the State had a law passed by the Legislature which transferred the control of Boston's police force from the Mayor of the city to the Governor of the State. The object was to enable the Republicans to convert the police into a party machine which would increase their strength in a Democratic stronghold, and this object has been pursued without concealment for the past four years. The police, and through them the liquor-dealers, gamblers, and criminal classes, have been drawn to the support of the Republican party in Boston through the instinct of self-preservation. The result has been that while the Democratic strength in the city has been cut down, the lawless elements of the population have grown in audacity, and the enforcement of the laws against them has become more and more lax. Gov. Russell is trying to mend matters by removing a police commissioner who is chiefly responsible for the demoralization of the force by means of political uses of it, and appointing a Republican of high character in his place. It is said that the Republicans of the Governor's Council are determined to oppose him in this by refusing to approve the new appointment, and by upholding the present commissioner.

The Newfoundland trouble is entering on a more acute phase nearly every week. A resolution signed by all members of both houses of the Legislature has been transmitted to the Colonial Office, protesting in the strongest terms against the threat of coercion contained in the bill now before Parliament giving the Crown fresh power to enforce the treaty with France. The Ministry is evidently in a condition of great perplexity over the matter. France has a hold on them which she will not relinquish, through fear of weakening her position in Egypt; and the only excuse which can be made for coercing Newfoundland for her benefit is the one Lord Salisbury makes, viz., that in case of war with France, England would have to defend Newfoundland. But the Newfoundlanders would plainly sooner have their shores to themselves than have England's guarantee. The affair would be capable of a money settlement were it not for the Egyptian complication. It ought to and probably will give a death-blow to the "Imperial Federation" scheme, for it will bring home to all the colonies the embarrassments which might overtake them were they to become responsible for the maintenance of the British Empire as it now is.

The English are laboring in a somewhat helpless way with a very melancholy judicial complication. Sir James Stephen is one of the Justices of the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice, better known, perhaps, to an earlier generation as Fitzjames Stephen, the author of 'Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity,' and of various essays on law, politics, and morals, in which the views of the Positivist school were set forth with a vigor that sometimes bordered on the humorous. But he has also achieved much fame in legal circles as the author of a code for India, of a Digest of the Law of Evidence, a Digest of the Criminal Law, and a History of the Criminal Law of England. Moreover, he was for the usual term of five years the Legal Member of the Governor-General's Council in India—a place once filled by Macaulay and more recently by Sir Henry Maine. He has filled his present place on the bench since 1879, and, in spite of a somewhat dogmatic manner and an over-readiness to take part in current political discussion, has filled it admirably. Recently a growing infirmity of temper and grave fits of forgetfulness on the bench have alarmed the bar and the suitors in his court, and have led to strong pressure on him to resign, which, however, he has resented and resisted. An application in the House of Commons to the Government to take up his case has been refused by Mr. Smith, on the very good ground that any readiness on the part of the Ministry of the day to procure a judge's removal might be construed as, or might some day degenerate into, an attack on the independence of the judiciary; and he intimated that the moving of the address to the Crown which was necessary in such cases, ought to come from a private member, so as to deprive it of all party color. No private member has as yet shown signs of any inclination for the task, as, of course, all the Judge's friends desire, if possible, to avoid removal by procuring his voluntary resignation. The latest news is, that the Lord Chief Justice has induced him to refrain from sitting in court pending a thorough medical examination of his condition.

The affair has brought out a good deal of comment on the numerous cases in which English judges, high and low, continue to discharge their duties with faculties impaired by great age, to the very serious injury of litigants. At present there appears to be no machinery for dealing with such cases. There is not, as in Continental countries, any Minister of Justice charged with a general supervision of the courts and responsible for the character and competency of the judges; so that old judges, like old ministers of the Established Church, sometimes hold on to their places after hearing and sight and memory and judgment have all become impaired. Our rule of compulsory retirement at seventy, in fact, seems to be looming up as a probable solution of the difficulty; but the English will never copy our system of turning old judges out in the world without any provision for their decent maintenance. No judge in England will be forced to retire without a good pension, so that his latter official years will not be disturbed, nor his independence menaced, by pecuniary cares.

The condition of rural France has some resemblance to that of rural New England. The *Économiste Français* gives a digest of a number of recent documents relating to the condition of the agricultural laborer there. Wages of farm hands have quadrupled during the present century, and the greatest increase has been in the lowest form of labor. The man-of-all-work who was paid only 96 francs per year in addition to his board in 1834, now gets 400 francs, while the shepherd, "the aristocrat of the farm," who received then 360 francs and board, now gets only 600. His wages have not doubled, while those of the humbler workman have more than quadrupled. The increase of wages of farm hands is ascribed in part to the demand for labor in factories and on railroads, and in part to the military service, which takes young men from the farms at the period when their habits are forming, and gives them a taste of town life from which they are never wholly weaned. When their term of service expires, they begin to look for situations in the towns and to worry the public men to find places for them. These drafts upon the rural population, tending to lessen the number of farm laborers, raise the wages of those who remain. The result is smaller profits to the farmer and a sort of agricultural crisis. Still another fact in the matter of rural depopulation is noticed, namely, a diminution in the number of children. Several cantons are named in which there has been a marked decrease of population since 1868. In two of these the ascertained reason for a diminution of the number of births was "the desire of the parents to improve their own condition," and it is added that this effect has followed. Here we find real Malthusianism in practice.

In consequence of the scarcity of French rural labor, Italians come over the southern border and Belgians over the northern to work for stated periods and then go back to their homes. In Corsica the Italians come in squads of six to ten, each under a leader, whom they call the Corporal, who is generally the best workman, and whom they pay something extra for his services as Corporal. Their wages are usually 450 francs per year, out of which they pay their own expenses (board 160 francs, travelling 35 francs, Corporal's fees 15 francs), so that they are able to carry back at the end of the year's work 240 francs ($48), which is considered by them good pay. In the north of France, Belgian laborers flock over the border from the middle of July to the first of September in great numbers. They are described as sober, frugal, seldom seen in the wine-shops, and lodging on the farms where they work. In one small commune of 150 inhabitants in the Department of the Nord 10,000 francs in wages was paid to transient Belgian laborers in one harvest, because French laborers could not be obtained.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR. PHELPS ON MR. BLAINE.

A VERY singular article is contributed to the April *Harper's* by Mr. E. J. Phelps, our late Minister to England, on "The Bering Sea Controversy." To appreciate its singularity fully, one must know that the Bering Sea controversy, *quâ* controversy, was closed in 1888 by the agreement between Secretary Bayard and Lord Salisbury, to which Russia was a party, making provision for a close time in Bering Sea, and for the hindrance of seal-killing in the interval. In making that agreement, of course, Lord Salisbury admitted the interest and value of seal life and the importance of preventing the extermination of the breed. When Mr. Phelps last had official cognizance of the matter, the execution of this agreement awaited, as appeared by the correspondence, two things, the consent and approval of Canada—the real party in interest on the British side—and the passage of an act of Parliament conferring on the Government the necessary powers. Our chargé in London, Mr. Phelps being absent, was so satisfied that all was settled that he kept going to the British Foreign Office asking, "Has Canada been heard from?" Canada had not been heard from when Mr. Phelps went out of office, and the reason was that the Canadians contested the facts of the American case touching the effect on the number of seals of seal-killing in the open sea, and insisted on the taking of further evidence. This caused very unfortunate delay. But the delay left only two questions for further discussion, namely, the right of Canada to interfere in the negotiations, and the accuracy of American figures. These were the points, and the only ones, left for Mr. Blaine, or Mr. Phelps, or any one else to consider when the Cleveland Administration went out of office. There was some excuse for Canadian doubt in the fact that both in 1887 and 1888 Mr. Tingle, the American agent, had reported the seals as rapidly increasing in spite of the poachers, and there was other testimony of a similar character forthcoming.

The delay was very regrettable. It is not necessary for our present purpose to say whether it was excusable or not. But Mr. Blaine, becoming impatient under it, took the law into his own hands by authorizing or permitting American cruisers to seize British ships in the open sea, and carry them into port as lawful prizes. This raised the new question, Have the United States jurisdiction of the sea known as Bering Sea, so as to make it a *mare clausum?* In answer to this, Mr. Blaine wrote to Sir Julian Pauncefote (January 22, 1890) "that it is not necessary to argue the question of the extent and nature of the sovereignty of this Government over the waters of Bering Sea; it is not necessary to explain, certainly not to define, the powers and privileges ceded by his Imperial Majesty the Emperor of Russia in the treaty by which the Alaskan territory was ceded to the United States." "The weighty considerations growing out of that transfer might," he said, "be safely left out of view," while he justified "the action complained of by her Majesty's Government." That meant, of course, that a complete justification was to be found elsewhere for the seizure of British ships on the high seas by American cruisers. What was it?

It was that the killing of seals in the open sea was a "pursuit that was in itself *contra bonos mores*" (January 22, 1890). Now, this argument startled lawyers and publicists all over the world. *Contra bonos mores* is a term of municipal, not of international law. Nations have between themselves no rule of right and wrong which is not the result of general formal agreement or acquiescence. No one has the power to set up moral standards of conduct for the others. No one was able to do this even with regard to the slave trade. When Mr. Blaine announced, therefore, that killing seals in the open sea was a violation of international obligation which might be resisted by force, diplomatists rubbed their eyes. Why seals more than whales? they said. Because seals are interesting and useful, answered Mr. Blaine. But the same thing is true of whales. A leading naturalist* has pronounced whales "in many respects the most interesting and wonderful of all creatures." But seals are warm-blooded mammals, says Mr. Blaine. So are whales. But seals may be easily exterminated, if killed too freely. So may whales. They supplied oil for the scholar's lamp for centuries, and would probably have disappeared wholly from all the accessible seas before now, but for the invention of illuminating-gas and the discovery of petroleum. But who ever thought of putting whales under the protection of international "boni mores"?

Now, here is a point at which we should have said Mr. Phelps's intervention in the controversy would be most useful. He is a lawyer and a lecturer on law, and has spent four years in the diplomatic service. He ought to have something illuminating to say on this very novel proposition of Mr. Blaine's. We accordingly turned to the article in *Harper's* with much curiosity. What he says is this: that the game laws of all civilized nations forbid the destruction of wild animals (not noxious) during the period of gestation, and particularly the laws of Great Britain; that seals are very interesting and valuable wild animals; that "the repression [of their slaughter when heavy with young] ought not to be the subject of a moment's debate between Christian nations"; and that besides this they are "a large and valuable property." Not one word has he offered, or apparently has to offer, on the question whether there is an international game law; whether there is a rule of international law, known as *boni mores;* and whether under such rule each nation has the right to capture and condemn as pirates foreign vessels engaged in sealfishing on the high seas. He intimates, or hints, that there ought to be such a rule, but he does not affirm that there is one; and he has previously admitted that the British Government, when the question was first raised, entirely concurred in the arguments brought forward on our side in favor of protection for the seals by mutual agreement between England and America (*H. M.*, p. 767.)

The most remarkable feature in the property argument is, however, Mr. Phelps's proposition that "this colony of seals, making their home on American soil, and unable to exist without a home on some soil, belong to the owners of the soil and are part of their property, and do not lose this quality by passing from one part of the territory to another in a regular and periodical migration necessary to their life, even though in making it they pass temporarily through water that is more than three miles from land" (*H. M.*, p. 769). It is difficult to decide whether this should be treated as law or natural history. In either view it is as novel as it is erroneous. It would, if good law, make it criminal to kill any migratory bird—wild ducks, wild geese, swallows, robins, or a host of others—away from their breeding-place, or salmon or shad away from their spawning-ground, and in fact would fill the world with somewhat absurd claims and more absurd quarrels. Moreover, neither Mr. Phelps nor any one else knows where the colony of seals go when they leave the Aleutian Islands. This is still a mystery.

Six months later (June 30, 1890) Mr. Blaine abandoned or dropped the *contra bonos mores* argument, and took his stand on the rights and privileges over Bering Sea transferred by the Russian Government to that of the United States when it sold Alaska. These rights, he said, included the right to prohibit the approach of foreign vessels within one hundred miles of the shores of Bering Sea. Mr. Blaine's contention is, that the issue of a ukase in 1821 containing this prohibition proves that the Czar had the right to issue it, and that when the United States and Great Britain protested against all claims on the part of Russia to exercise any jurisdiction over the high seas or any part of "the Southern Ocean," they did not mean Bering Sea, because in various contemporaneous maps the body of water now known as Bering Sea appears as such, and not as the "Pacific" or "Southern Ocean," and is spoken of as such by various contemporaneous writers. The futility, or one might say the childishness, of this was easily pointed out by Lord Salisbury, for if the distinction had any value, it would show that the Bay of Biscay was no part of the Atlantic Ocean, and the Gulf of Lyons no part of the Mediterranean. The leading geographer of Europe has recently testified that it was a chimera of Mr. Blaine's. Moreover, Russia is not on record as having ever attempted to put the ukase in force against any foreign vessels, so that there never was any occasion to contest her claim in detail or before any legal tribunal.

England denies Mr. Blaine's interpretation of her protest against Russian claims. That America ever admitted this particular one, Mr. Blaine extracts from a despatch of the elder Adams by a feat of forced implication. No special mention of the claim to jurisdic-

*Prof. Flower.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion over Bering Sea has been made by any contemporary writer. Mr. Fish, writing in 1875 on the Canadian fishery question, showed he had never heard of it. No American Secretary since 1825 has ever even alluded to it.

But if the claim were well founded, its inevitable consequence in the forum of international law was to make Bering Sea a *mare clausum*. No sea has ever been forbidden to foreign vessels for one hundred miles from the shore except a sea acknowledged by all concerned to be a *mare clausum*. But, says Mr. Blaine—again—(June 20, 1890)—"It did not, as so many claim, declare the Bering Sea to be a *mare clausum*. It did declare the waters, to the extent of 100 miles from the shores, were reserved for the subjects of the Russian Empire." Now, is it possible for any Power to do this? Is there such a thing known to the law of nations as a *mare semi-clausum*—that is, a sea which can be cut up into compartments outside the three-mile limit, and some reserved for the jurisdiction of municipal law, and others left to international law?

We looked to Mr. Phelps's article with much interest for an answer to this question, which the whole cast of Mr. Blaine's mind and the nature of his training make it impossible for him to give. One has only to count the adjectives in his despatches to see the unfitness of his mental constitution for the work of diplomacy. What does Mr. Phelps tell us? Simply that Mr. Blaine has "presented the argument on this point with great ability, fulness, and clearness, and there seems to be nothing left to be added in either particular"! This contribution to the discussion strikingly resembles those already made by our learned contemporary, the *Tribune*.

The really important portion of Mr. Phelps's article is the concluding part, where he reproves American writers for criticising or opposing Mr. Blaine's views in this controversy, where he ridicules arbitration as a mode of settling this and, indeed, it would seem, any international difference, and advises Mr. Blaine to use force in Bering Sea without further delay against what he considers depredations on American property. We presume the article was written before Lord Salisbury and Mr. Blaine had agreed on arbitration as the sensible, rational, and humane course. The lives of men slain in the smallest war between England and America being, *pace* Mr. Phelps, far more valuable than those of all the seals that ever migrated or gestated, it is hardly necessary to discuss this point further. But all Mr. Phelps's friends on both sides of the water will be sorry to see a man of his standing counselling violence as a desirable substitute, under any circumstances, for a possible resort to an impartial tribunal administering, under the rules of right reason, established international usage.

His dislike for arbitration clearly influences, if it does not shape, his view as to the function of the press during international controversies. It is natural that one who believes in war as a not undesirable mode of settling international quarrels, should look on all previous discussion as in some degree preparation for war, and expect the national press during a diplomatic discussion to occupy itself simply in inflaming popular passions in support of a bellicose issue. But the better portion of the press in all civilized countries has long refused to play this rôle. Mr. Phelps is mistaken in supposing the English press plays it. The best newspapers denounced Lord Salisbury's diplomacy in dealing with Russia in 1878 as warmly as it now supports it. Journalists who respect themselves, no longer cry ditto to every extravagance and monstrosity which ambitious politicians momentarily in power produce to tickle the ears of the groundlings.

The following declaration of Mr. Phelps, also touching the share of the public in these controversies, needs much limitation, qualification, and explanation:

> "A nation divided against itself can never achieve a diplomatic success. A Government that is not backed up by the unanimous sentiment of its people, but is opposed in its dealings with foreign nations by a large share of the best intelligence of its own country, if not in the ends it seeks, at least in all the means it takes to obtain them, will never be a formidable figure in diplomacy, especially when its force is found to expend itself in argument rather than in action."

The saying that all party differences should cease at the ocean's edge is only a half truth. Even when war has been declared by our Congress, it is debatable therein when the war should cease, and may be a proper party issue. Treaties are now open to popular discussion in countries where they are not binding till ratified by Parliament or Senate, or executed by Congress. When, in our own history, has a subject like the Bering Sea dispute been withdrawn from newspaper or Congressional debate? We wish no "formidable figure" in our diplomacy that cannot bear the keen sunlight of publicity and fair discussion. What are all the fur seals present and to come in Bering Sea worth to our country and its taxpayers? What are the taxpayers willing to expend or imperil for those fur seals? Those are questions for voters, for Congress, for the law to decide, and not solely for our agents, whether diplomatic or executive. What is going on in the British House of Commons today over the diplomacy of Lord Salisbury and Lord Knutsford over Newfoundland?

SUMMER BOARDING AND RURAL HEALTH.

THE possibilities of the summer-boarder industry are coming to be more fully realized by New Englanders every year. Considering his reputation for shrewdness, the Yankee has been unusually slow to recognize the importance of this crop, and it is still difficult to convince the people in the "back districts" that there are literally "millions in it" to any State which will cultivate it with care. A few far-seeing men are gradually getting their neighbors' eyes open, prominent among them being Mr. Oramandal Smith, Secretary of State in Maine, and Mr. N. J. Bachelder, Commissioner of Agriculture and Immigration in New Hampshire. A few years ago Mr. Smith brought together a mass of valuable matter, showing the great importance which this industry had already attained in the Pine-Tree State, and urging the people to redouble their efforts to attract the tide of summer travel in that direction. Mr. Bachelder has recently sent out from his office a very creditable pamphlet, which contains many really excellent views of the lakes with which New Hampshire abounds, and gives a long list of places where summer boarders are taken, with names and rates, arranged alphabetically by towns.

The railroad companies, which have hardly shown their usual enterprise in this matter, are also waking up, and two or three of the chief lines leading to the lakes and the mountains of northern New England—like the Boston and Maine and the Central Vermont—are spending considerable sums this year in collecting and publishing the detailed information needed by the general public, while they also announce lower rates of fare than heretofore. These efforts are now especially directed towards "opening up" Vermont, which has never had a tithe of the summer visitors to which its remarkable charms of natural beauty entitle it. But the Green Mountain folk have themselves chiefly to blame for this, for they have done little to advertise the attractions of their State. Even now that the transportation companies offer their aid, the farmers are slow to respond. "The Boston and Maine Railroad," says the St. Johnsbury *Caledonian*, "has twice sent an agent over the Passumpsic and Lake roads to obtain full lists of hotels and boarding-houses, with number of rooms, rates per day and week, etc. Yet we are informed that the responses to these inquiries have not given as complete information as could be desired."

The financial gain to the farmer from the advent of the summer boarder is obvious to everybody. But there are other advantages to the rural community that follow in his train which are not so apt to be thought of. One is the marked improvement in the sanitary condition of a State which is sure to be brought about if a large number of its villages are visited by outsiders during the summer. This phase of the subject is discussed in an interesting manner by the New Hampshire State Board of Health in its recent annual report.

This Board has now been in existence nine years, and the report opens with an expression of justifiable pride in the progress which has been made during this period. It says that there is probably not a town in the State but is in a better sanitary condition than it was five years ago, and that in many rural towns the continuance of undesirable conditions is owing to the lack of funds rather than to a total ignorance of their bearing upon life and health. "Towns that for generations gave no thought to hygiene have been aroused from their inactivity to intelligent and systematic action, and the results are to be witnessed on every hand. Typhoid fever has almost vanished from some towns that formerly had an annual outbreak of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

disease. Scarlet fever has been greatly lessened by isolation and disinfection, and diphtheria by the same means is rendered less fearful to any community that will avail itself of these safeguards. No progressive town to-day thinks of neglecting sanitary matters, or of ignoring an outbreak of infectious or contagious diseases, as was formerly the practice."

While due credit for the improvement is given to the many efficient and active local boards of health, and to the better information of the average citizen in regard to the sanitary necessities of his town and the importance of sanitation to private and public interests, it is pointed out that "private interests are the greater stimulus to sanitary action, as evidenced by the work accomplished in manufacturing communities and in towns frequented by summer boarders." The report says that tens of thousands of summer visitors come into the State annually in search of recreation and health, and that "a majority of these visitors are of the most intelligent classes, and are, as they should be, ever watchful for agreeable and healthful surroundings. They demand that the conditions shall be such that the danger of incurring disease therefrom shall be reduced to the minimum."

The Board maintains that "it is the duty of the State to protect, as far as it is able, the health of the thousands who visit this 'Switzerland of America' each year." After speaking of the incalculable benefit to the State of the money which they leave, the report takes this broad view of the various ways in which the commonwealth profits: "The summer traveller has made valuable many a valley and hillside that without his patronage would not be worth the taxes now paid upon the property; supports schools and churches; builds better highways; beautifies and vivifies many a town that but for him would be moss-grown and silent; constructs and maintains railroad lines; exerts a moral and educational influence; contributes to the culture and intelligence of many localities; increases property valuation; and in innumerable other ways adds to the welfare and prosperity of the State."

In return the State incurs certain obligations to the summer visitor, first among which is his protection against diseases arising from sanitary neglect or oversight. It is encouraging to learn that the Board finds the proprietors of hotels and boarding-houses, as a rule, alive to the importance of good sanitation and the pecuniary benefit accruing therefrom. "It is not a difficult matter to secure the needed improvement," says the report, "when it is known that a single case of diphtheria, typhoid fever, or other zymotic disease means an immediate loss of business; and as a rule the summer-resort property-owners pay close attention to the sanitary needs of their respective places."

Every careful observer knows that there is a large measure of fallacy in the traditional belief about the necessary healthfulness of country life. It should be healthy, and it is under proper conditions; but in many a community zymotic diseases prevail year after year simply because of the ignorance or carelessness of the people regarding fundamental rules of hygiene. Perhaps the most beneficent work of the summer boarder is to convince the farming population that a large proportion of the disease among them is unnecessary, and that it must be abolished or visitors will not come.

REFORM IN PRUSSIAN TAXATION.

On the 20th of November last, the new Prussian Finance Minister, Dr. Miquel, explained to the House of Deputies the reform of taxation which, in the name of the Government, he had proposed. Its aim is so to change the direct or personal taxes that their weight upon each taxpayer may be more nearly than heretofore in proportion to his ability to bear it. Questions of increased revenue do not come into consideration. The Minister emphasized that fact, and with reason. The recent denial that Dr. Miquel is about to take Caprivi's place as Chancellor of the Empire does not deny that the Doctor aspires to the Chancellorship; and since he is a "parliamentary" statesman, whose skill lies rather in coming to terms with opposition than in conquering it, each favorable vote is one more stepping-stone to the office whose recent not-parliamentary occupant commonly forced majorities to come to terms with him. To Dr. Miquel, therefore, a proposition to reform taxation and a proposition to increase revenue are, just at present, two quite separate things. Nevertheless, while the existing Prussian tax system can doubtless be improved without increasing its productiveness, any genuine tax reform must recognize, among other things, the necessity of increasing the public revenue.

The division of taxes among the different taxing powers in Germany is quite similar to that which has taken place in the United States. Import duties are as completely forbidden to Prussia as to Pennsylvania, and the Empire has laid hands on the most important objects of indirect internal taxation—on salt, sugar, tobacco, liquor, and beer. The principal sources of Prussia's revenue are, therefore, domains, forests and mines, fees of the courts, bridge, road, and harbor tolls; earnings of the State railways; taxes on real estate, on trades and industries, on incomes, and on inheritances. The pending reform concerns only the last three taxes, and in judging it one must therefore bear in mind that the proposed taxes constitute only part of the tax system. If they seem to fall heaviest upon the rich, it must be remembered that duties on bread and clothing, and taxes on salt, sugar, and beer, fall heaviest upon the poor.

The existing tax on trades and industries (*Gewerbesteuer*) is based substantially on the law of May 30, 1820. Taxable are trade and manufacturing, inn-keeping, handicraft in case the master-workman employs several assistants. An industry situated in a large town is taxed more heavily than one situated in a small town, on the antiquated assumption that only a large place can support a large industry; and the matter is further complicated by the division of industries in large places, and also of industries in small places, into three grades with different tax-rates according to the extent of the industry. The inequality of a tax assessed on modern industries according to hard-and-fast rules that were made before the invention of railways, may be imagined. Large industries pay, as a rule, less than 1 per cent. of their profits, while on the contrary the handicrafts frequently pay more than 2 per cent. The proposed reform exempts from the tax all industries—about one-third of the whole number—which neither employ 3,000 marks capital nor have profits of 1,500 marks yearly, but subjects inn-keeping, a large portion of which would go free under the exemption, to a new special tax. The larger industries are divided into four classes, the highest class having at least a capital of one million marks or a yearly profit of 50,000 marks. For this class the tax is 1 per cent. of the profits. The three lower classes are taxed at slightly less rates, and the tax is assessed partly on the profits and partly on the capital.

Under the present system of income taxation, all natural persons enjoying incomes of 900 marks or more are taxed. Historically and formally the tax is divided into two parts, a class-tax (*Klassensteuer*) on incomes between 900 and 3,000 marks, and an income tax proper on incomes above 3,000 marks. Practically the two parts form one tax. The new, unified tax will be levied on legal as well as on natural persons, and, like the existing tax, on no income less than 900 marks. Like the existing tax, again, the new is to be a digressive income tax, *i. e.*, all incomes larger than a fixed amount (to be 10,000 marks) are to be taxed at a uniform rate (3 per cent.), while smaller incomes are taxed at a continually diminishing rate, falling, in case of an income of 900 marks, to 0.62 per cent.

Incomes will be divided, as at present, into grades, but the new graduation will be much closer. For instance, there are now fourteen grades of income between 3,000 and 20,000 marks, and there will be twenty-six grades. Incomes will not be taxed upon exact figures, but only as belonging to some one grade; and the tax will be computed upon the middle, and not, as heretofore, upon the lowest figure of the grade. Thus, all incomes falling in Grade twenty-six (9,500 to 10,500 marks) are taxed 3 per cent. on 10,000 marks.

In addition to this attempt to render the tax more equal by making the income grades smaller, the reform proposes, as a much more effective measure of justice, an extended application of the principle, already recognized in Prussian tax legislation, that the condition of the taxpayer shall be considered in assessing his income. The most important of the provisions looking to this end allows, in the case of incomes less than 3,000 marks, a deduction of 50 marks from the assessment on account of each child under fourteen years of age. Other considerations which may operate to reduce assessment are an obligation (actually fulfilled) to support relatives who

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have no property and contribute nothing to the taxpayer's income; prolonged sickness; accident. These considerations may effect, in case of an income below 3,000 marks, at most a reduction of three grades; from an income between 3,000 and 6,000 marks, at most of two grades. From incomes above 6,000 marks no reduction is made. The greatest reduction of tax, therefore, that can take place from any combination of these three causes is from 54 to 36 marks for an income of full 3,000 marks, and from 165 to 135 marks for an income of full 6,000 marks.

The proposition to extend the income tax to legal persons, *i. e.*, to stock companies, whose shareholders already pay an income tax on the dividends, has met just opposition as double taxation. This objection the Minister seeks to meet, first, by freeing from the tax 3 per cent. of each company's earnings; and, second, by the rather droll assertion that because the cities are permitted to tax such income twice, the State might as well tax it twice also.

The first change to be made in the existing law regarding assessments is, that each person enjoying an income of 3,000 marks or over is expected to declare the amount upon which he is taxable. Assessment by declaration has not lacked critics. Mill considered it "unequal in one of the worst ways," the tax "falling heaviest on the most conscientious." This objection is manifestly conditioned by the state of public morals among the taxpayers. Minister Miquel believes that, in respect of tax-dodging at least, the Prussians are conscientious. In introducing the declaration clause he said: "I have full faith that the Prussian citizen, when required on his honor to tell the truth to the State, as a rule will tell the truth." Nevertheless, Dr. Miquel does not propose to walk by faith alone. While he believes that a personal appeal to individual citizens will, in many instances, stimulate the dormant sense of civic duty, he provides also a more tangible stimulus. The declaration will not be obligatory, but the taxpayer who neglects to make it loses the right of complaint in case he is over-assessed. Any taxpayer who "consciously makes an incorrect or incomplete return which may lead to the diminution of his tax, or in any way conceals taxable income," is finable from four to ten times the whole amount of which he has defrauded or attempted to defraud the State, but in no case less than 100 marks.

But of course local assessors who are not independent enough to assess as well as they know how at present cannot be expected to follow a new and stricter system. The second change to be made in the present law regarding assessment provides, therefore, that while a majority of each new board of assessment shall be elected, as heretofore, from the district, a minority shall be permanent trained assessors appointed from Berlin. Exactly where these trained assessors are to come from is not very clear. Probably they must get their official training in office; but that is exactly what the elected assessors are obliged to do, and as the appointed assessors will be independent of local influence, and will make assessment their business, they bid fair to become the more efficient part of the Board. Nevertheless, it is doubtful whether they will be able to accomplish all that is expected of them. Dr. Miquel's proposition, in so far as it deals with declarations and appointed assessors, is closely modelled on a law adopted in Saxony in 1878. In the opinion of the Saxon assessors, assessment is much more equal than under the old law. It is difficult to reconcile their opinion with the facts. The following table shows, in millions of marks, the amount of income from the principal sources as assessed in Saxony in 1883 and in 1878:

	Land.	Interest and Rent.	Trade and Industry	Salaries and Wages.
1883.....	233	135	378	450
1878.....	214	109	357	334
Increase.....	19	26	21	116

Income from salaries and wages is notoriously easy to assess, and consequently suffers injustice under any system of assessment. A reform, therefore, which increases such income 37 per cent., whereas income from interest and rent is increased 24 per cent. and income from trade and industry, in one of the chief manufacturing sections of Germany, but 6 per cent., does not deserve untempered admiration. The proposed means for checking incorrect and fraudulent income returns in Prussia are apparently in no way superior to those provided by the Saxon law, and, save upon the assumption that Prussians are more honest than Saxons, there is no reason to expect a closer approximation to justice.

The third of the taxes which Minister Miquel seeks to reform is that on inheritances. Prussia has already a tax on bequests to distant relatives and unrelated persons, but, as in most other States of Germany, bequests to near relatives are free. The reform proposition provides that legacies of more than 1,000 marks (excluding from the estimate clothing, house furniture, etc.) shall be taxed 1 per cent. in case the legatee is husband or wife, and one-half per cent. in case the legatee is a lineal descendant of the testator. This tax has two purposes in view—first, to furnish a means of checking income assessments, and, second, to tax funded income higher than personal or professional income. It is, perhaps, the most clearly justifiable part of the whole reform proposition. Curiously enough, it has roused more opposition than any other part, and its failure in the House of Deputies seems assured.

A question naturally and frequently asked is: What will be the financial result of the new system? According to the estimate, the income from the *Gewerbesteuer* will not be altered; the tax on inheritances, if adopted, will bring in three and a-half or four million marks more than the present tax; and the income tax, improved assessment being left out of account, will lose more by the new exemptions than it will gain by the multiplication of the income grades and the inclusion of the stock companies. Whether this resulting deficiency, estimated at less than two million marks, will be covered, or more than covered, by the sharper assessment, Dr. Miquel declines even to guess. Similar assessment devices raised the revenue from the income tax in Saxony 20 per cent. in five years. A like increase in Prussia, where the income tax in 1889-90 yielded sixty-six million marks, would justify an estimate of at least sixteen or seventeen millions larger revenue as the net result of the changes in all taxes.

But the proposed reform does not deal at all with the most troublesome part of the Prussian tax question, viz., local taxation. At present, local expenditures are met by a surtax, or addition to the State tax; but for several years there has been talk of handing over the trades and industries, or, as in Pennsylvania, the real estate, for local taxation. Minister Miquel talks with admirable indefiniteness about his intentions—sometimes he calls them simply hopes—of doing something of the sort as a result of the pending reform, or of measures based upon it. There the ambitious parliamentarian once more gets the better of the financier.

GENERAL JOHNSTON.

THE death of Gen. Joseph E. Johnston (which occurred at Washington on Saturday evening), so soon after that of Gen. Sherman, at whose funeral he was one of the pall-bearers, will seem to the country a coincidence giving a dramatic completeness to the history of these great men who were antagonists in the critical campaigns of Atlanta and of North Carolina, in which the fate of the rebellion was sealed. They had also been personally pitted against each other in the subordinate campaign of central Mississippi after the fall of Vicksburg. Thus it happened that from July, 1863, till Johnston's surrender near Raleigh at the close of April, 1865, and from the Mississippi River eastward to the ocean and thence northward nearly to Virginia, the fortunes of the nation were staked upon the military leadership of these two men—the one, with tireless aggression, leading the Union armies ever deeper into the heart of the Confederacy; and the other, with sleepless wariness and signal ability, exhausting the resources of the military art to neutralize the superiority of force on the national side, and to postpone to the latest hour the downfall of the cause to which he had devoted himself. This great duel will always be the part of his career first thought of and most vividly recalled when Johnston is named, but he had been prepared for this work by a long military career reaching back to a time which few living persons have seen.

Joseph Eccleston Johnston was a native of Prince Edward County, Virginia, born in February, 1807. He was graduated from West Point and entered the United States Army in 1829. With the exception of a single year (1837-'38) when he tried his fortunes as a civil engineer, he was constantly in the military service of the Government till he followed his seceding State in April, 1861. He was a captain of topographical engineers on the staff of Gen. Scott at the beginning of the Mexican war, in which he was twice wounded and was brevetted major, lieutenant-colonel, and colonel for gallant conduct and meritorious service, entering the City of Mexico as commandant of the Voltigeur

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

regiment which he had brilliantly led in the latter part of the campaign, and in which he was appointed Lieutenant-Colonel. His regiment was disbanded on the reduction of the army after the war, and he returned to duty in the corps of topographical engineers. He served as Inspector-General with the Utah expedition of 1858, and in June, 1860, he was made Quartermaster-General of the Army with the rank of brigadier-general.

On the secession of Virginia, he resigned his commission and went to Richmond, when he was immediately made Major-General of Virginia troops by Gov. Letcher. He tells us in his narrative that "no other officer of the United States Army of equal rank, that of brigadier-general, relinquished his position in it to join the Southern Confederacy." This was literally true, though Lee was his equal in age, both being fifty-four, and nearly his equal in rank. They had served together in Mexico and had been side by side in much of their military duty. They resigned together, and together were appointed to equal rank in the Virginia army. They entered the service of the new Confederacy together as Brigadiers, and were together made generals when that grade was created by the Confederate Congress. A day or two may have separated them in one or another of these steps, but for all practical purposes they were simultaneous.

Johnston's first command in the civil war was at Harper's Ferry, where he organized the forces that were assembled to cover the Shenandoah Valley on both north and west. When the advance of the national army under McDowell against Beauregard became imminent, Johnston transferred his command to Manassas, and in the battle which followed he was in command as the ranking officer on the field, though he gave such full scope and recognition to the energies of Gen. Beauregard as to prove that the position of second in command could be made a most brilliant one instead of the dubious and undesirable thing it is commonly reckoned.

The results of his successful engagement, while putting him officially in the lead of all the Confederate officers, planted the seeds of subsequent griefs and disappointments; for controversies arose as to the personal relations of Mr. Davis, as Confederate President, to the campaign, in which the President's susceptibilities were wounded. A personal antipathy was excited between him and Gens. Johnston, Beauregard, and G. W. Smith, which was never healed, and which affected permanently the fortunes of these officers. The law passed by the Confederate Congress in May, 1861, provided that as between officers of the same grade in the Confederate Army who had gone from the United States service, seniority should be determined by their former rank. Under this rule Gen. Johnston was senior of the five generals created, the others being Cooper, A. S. Johnston, Lee, and Beauregard. But when in August Mr. Davis sent in his nominations to the Senate, he fixed arbitrary dates at which the commissions should take effect, so that Joseph Johnston was reduced from first to fourth place. Against this the latter protested, but it was held that the confirmation by the Senate gave to the change the effect of law. The antagonism thus created was permanent, and rendered cordial coöperation between Davis and Johnston almost impossible, though both were undoubtedly devoted to the cause in which they were embarked.

Johnston remained in command of the Confederate Army before Washington during the year, and when, in the spring of 1862, McClellan transferred the Army of the Potomac to Fort Monroe, Johnston confronted him on the Peninsula, and from Yorktown to the Chickahominy illustrated the stubborn and skilful defensive strategy for which he afterwards became still more famous. At Seven Pines, on the 31st of May, he thought the looked-for opportunity to assume the offensive had come, and combined an attack by several columns upon a fraction of McClellan's army which had crossed the Chickahominy, then bankfull from a freshet and endangering McClellan's bridges. The bloody engagement of the day was indecisive, and near its close Johnston was wounded by a musket-ball and soon after unhorsed by a fragment of a shell which severely injured him. He was borne from the field when, as he tells us, he was about to give orders for his army to rest upon their arms and to renew the fight in the morning.

He was disabled for several months, and Lee succeeded to the command in which his great reputation was made. In the latter part of November Johnston, having recovered from his wounds, was assigned to command a military division in the west, including the departments of Bragg, Pemberton, and E. K. Smith. President Davis visited the west soon after, and endeavored by personal inspection to determine the lines of operation and the general policy which should control the four Confederate armies at that time in the Mississippi Valley. The antipathy of the men was such that no harmony was possible. Mr. Davis gave directions to such an extent as to make Gen. Johnston feel that his command was a merely nominal one, and rejected the plans which the General submitted. Johnston's health was also wretched, so that he looked back to that period with great disgust. The battle of Stone's River and the retreat to the Tennessee were conducted by Bragg as his subordinate in one department. The campaign and siege of Vicksburg, with the consequent stunning blow to the Confederate fortunes, were conducted by Pemberton in like relations to him. Pemberton overestimated the importance of preserving Vicksburg, and allowed himself to be shut up in that city when Johnston's orders were to break away while it was possible, and concentrate at Jackson, where Johnston himself was with a small army. The latter asserted that if his physical strength had been equal to it he would have joined Pemberton with an escort of cavalry, riding around the army of Grant. He would thus have assumed the immediate control of that campaign.

The winter of 1863-64 had destroyed the prestige of Gen. Bragg, and Johnston was ordered to supersede him in command of the Army of Tennessee. In this, as in later assignments to duty, the force of public opinion in the Confederacy constrained Mr. Davis, who acted unwillingly. Bragg, who retained Davis's friendship and confidence, became chief of staff to the Confederate President, and Johnston felt (rightly or wrongly) that the support given him was coldly perfunctory, and that his campaign would be watched at headquarters with unfriendly eyes. Mr. Davis strongly urged a dashing, aggressive policy. Johnston thought his force insufficient to adopt it with much chance of success. Persistence in his opinion was a marked trait of each of them; Johnston adhered to the policy of watchful defensive war, which he believed in by sincere conviction if he adopted it by natural temperament.

His campaign against Sherman is admitted to be a model of its kind. He was forced back mile by mile through half the length of Georgia, but each step in retreat was taken in perfect order, with no sacrifice of material, and with as little loss in men as was possible considering the incessant fighting which for three months had hardly a single day's intermission. There were no pitched battles in open field, for both Sherman and Johnston had developed the idea, now generally accepted by military men, that the increase of range and precision in modern firearms has necessitated a warfare of entrenched lines of field-works. The slow but steady retreat from Dalton to Atlanta gave to Mr. Davis the opportunity to insist upon his fixed idea of the dashing aggressive, and Johnston was removed. The practical destruction of the Confederate army under Hood is more conclusive than any theoretic argument as to the merit of the two systems in such circumstances, for Hood showed no mean ability in his campaign.

When Sherman had marched to the sea, and again, moving northward, was about to enter North Carolina, an overwhelming public sentiment demanded the reinstatement of Johnston. Mr. Davis was unable to sacrifice his personal pride and his rooted prejudice with a good grace, and the Confederate Congress in substance deposed him from the command-in-chief by giving this to Gen. Lee. Lee immediately assigned Johnston to the task of opposing the resistless march of Sherman. Though it was too late for great success, Johnston showed that he knew how to depart from his Fabian policy when occasion offered or necessity demanded. Directing Gen. Hardee with part of the forces hurriedly collected to delay the march of Sherman's column from the South, he sent Gen. Bragg with another portion to strike the forces which Schofield was leading from Newberne. This was to gain time to concentrate reinforcements at an intermediate point, and to precipitate his army by interior lines first upon Sherman and then upon Schofield. Neither Hardee's affair at Averasboro' nor Bragg's at Kinston was more than a check to the national armies, which continued their movements of concentration; but the strategy was none the less sound, and the execution was vigorous. It was met by a tenacity and readiness which prevented its success.

Quickly drawing together his detachments, he met Sherman again at Bentonville; but though he held his lines during a hard-fought day, he had to retreat by night when Sherman's columns were united and the superior force could be skilfully made to tell. Sherman met Schofield at Goldsboro' in exact accordance with his own plan, and Johnston's brilliant activity had accomplished little in material results. It had demonstrated, however, that no one could surpass him in a vigorous initiative when he chose to use it, and gave a conclusive answer to critics who insisted that his only rôle in war was the strict defence.

Still undaunted, he led his army to the west of Raleigh so that Sherman should not march into Virginia without offering his flank to attack. But the end had come. Lee surrendered, and though Mr. Davis, with characteristic stubbornness, thought that a new retreat by Johnston across the Carolinas and the Gulf States was feasible, and hoped that even in Texas a stand might be made, Johnston had the moral courage to insist that the war was over, and that mere brigandage or guerilla fighting without possible advantage would be the only consequence of what Davis proposed. A still more fearful scourge of the Southern States might have followed, but no result that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a statesman or a general could find satisfaction in.

Left to himself, Johnston negotiated an honorable surrender, and secured for his disbanded army not only personal safety, but the means of reaching their homes to resume peaceful industry. Like Lee, he put the war utterly behind him and used his great influence with the Southern people to renew the national allegiance in good faith, and to cultivate a new patriotism that should embrace the whole country. To that purpose he was true for a quarter of a century, and lived to have abundant proof that in the breasts of the most ardently loyal men of 1865 no sentiment towards him but respect and personal kindliness had survived.

As to his greatness as a military commander, the universal verdict declares that on the Confederate side only Lee could contest his preeminence. It would be, even now, a premature effort to seek to measure their relative capacity. The circumstances in which they acted were not the same, the national armies and generals against whom they were arrayed were unlike, the support they received from their own Government and the freedom of judgment and action given them were often in strong contrast. Each supported with consummate ability and with unfaltering constancy a cause which was at war with the progress of human liberty and true republicanism, and which was therefore predestined to defeat. Each met his reverses with a quiet dignity which made it easy for old antagonists to become their friends and admirers. Each so honestly helped to rebuild the new nationality on freedom and brotherhood that the whole nation has joined in rehabilitating them, and we bury them as honored fellow-citizens.

THE GEOGRAPHICAL EXHIBITION OF THE BROOKLYN INSTITUTE.

THE exhibition of geographical appliances brought together by the Department of Geography of the Brooklyn Institute, now open in the Arcade Building, Fulton Street, is decidedly the most successful of its kind ever held in this country; and it may be favorably compared with similar exhibitions in Europe. Its large series of maps, models, globes, atlases, and diagrams is most suggestive of the continually growing attention given to this fundamental department of our schooling. We are glad to learn that the exhibition has been well patronized, having had, as is estimated, an average attendance of a thousand persons a day since it opened at the beginning of the month, with overcrowding on Saturdays. It closes this week in Brooklyn, but we trust that the plan of the Institute to open it again in other cities, New York included, may be successfully carried out.

We are sure that the school board of any large city would find a very profitable occupation in coöperating with the Institute in this respect. The exhibition excites much interest among school-children by showing them new illustrations of subjects more or less familiar; it has the excellent effect of inspiring teachers to renewed efforts towards improving their materials and methods; it shows our publishers a grand series of European works, behind which ours fall so far; it offers to school superintendents the best possible opportunity of choosing new materials with which to replace what is old-fashioned or worn out; and, perhaps more important than anything yet mentioned, it presents to intending geographical writers a very good summary of what has been already accomplished. For all these reasons, the Geographic Department of the Institute will be well rewarded for its heavy labor and not slight expense.

The catalogue of the exhibition is divided into nine departments—maps, globes and telluriums, reliefs, models and apparatus, pictures, atlases, text-books, reference books, and miscellanies. These departments are again divided; for example, the first embraces maps of the World, America, Europe, Asia, Africa, and Australasia, and various detailed topographic surveys of small areas. The classification is in a few cases at fault; thus, the specimen sheets from the official Austrian Geographical Institute, No. 236 A, should have been placed under detailed topographic maps, rather than under maps in sheets; but we are inclined to believe that this slight confusion results from the great size to which the exhibition has grown and the moderate number of workers, all volunteers, on whom the labor of arrangement has fallen. With more time, the classification might have been carried further to advantage, so that, for instance, all political maps of Europe might have been separated from the physical maps; the geological maps of Bavaria, again, should have been placed with the special topographical maps under a joint heading. But as a whole there is little to criticise, and we make these few comments rather as suggestions for revision in case of exhibition in other cities than as reflections on the patient work of the Committee. It might be well to consider whether, in case of repeated exhibition, it would not be better to place all the publications of a single house together, as far as possible; purchasers could then judge much better of the effect produced than now, when the several maps of a series are scattered in different parts of the room. A set of maps as published seems to us a natural unit for exhibition. At the same time, the catalogue might remain divided according to subjects and countries, the numbers then remaining as cross references.

The exhibition is so large that it is impossible to mention more than a few of the most interesting of its parts. Of these, we may take first the wall maps of physical geography. Kiepert's series (Berlin: Reimer) is the most attractive from the well-chosen tints of brown and blue by which the relief of the land is indicated. These maps are clear and emphatic for class use; but, in their entire omission of names, they are sometimes embarrassing. In leaving the lowlands and all of the oceans but the shore-strip uncolored, this series is perhaps less satisfactory than others by Bamberg (Berlin: Chun), or than the Habenicht-Sydow series (Gotha: Perthes); but the last of these are too coarse except for the largest classes. One of the finest Mercator charts of the world in the collection is by Broichmann (Metz: Lang), a very artistic work. The world in hemispheres is best shown by Kiepert and Bamberg. It is noticeable that ocean currents are the most variable features on these physical maps, and that in nearly all they are too emphatic, too sharply defined.

Certain physical maps of single regions deserve special mention. Two of Great Britain and Ireland, published by Stanford of London, illustrate what we need for our own country; and now that a comparatively accurate contour map of the United States has been constructed under the direction of Mr. Henry Gannett of the Geological Survey, we hope our publishers may take advantage of it, and give us something comparable to what can be found for the European countries. One of the Stanford maps is called the Orographic, indicating successive altitudes by a series of green and brown tints; the other is the Stereographic, in imitation of a model, with the light coming from the northwest. The emphasis thus given to the relief is really rather too great; it reminds us of the exaggeration of models as commonly constructed. There are two maps of the Alpine region of central-southern Europe that call for high praise. One is by Von Haardt (Vienna, Hölzel), and is to be strongly commended for class use. The other is by Randegger (Zurich: Wurster), and embraces a somewhat larger area; it is of rather finer work and bears closer study, but both are excellent. There is also a hypsometrical map of France in ten tints on land and four on water by Hachette of Paris; and it should be added that this well-known firm has been most enterprising and generous in providing examples of its publications, in the form of maps, books, and atlases.

The detailed topographical maps are mostly of our own country. They are not for school service, but afford the very best basis for the advanced study of physical geography, in company with geological maps; they are also of the greatest value to publishers in the preparation of atlases and school maps of small scale. Our coast and geological surveys have done well in providing many examples of their work, which is but too little known by the people. It is to be regretted that the tinted relief-map of New Jersey is not exhibited apart from the series to which it belongs, in order to bring its existence more generally before the visitors. Various sheets of some of the older Government surveys are not exhibited for want of room; if the general chart of the Mississippi lowland by the Mississippi River Commission is among these, it should be brought to view, both for its excellence and its interest. Some of the special sheets of the same Commission ought to be placed beside the fine engravings of the Coast Survey. Of the countless political maps and charts we need only say that their bold colors are generally too bold, even for the needs of children.

Passing over the globes, which exhibit less variety and novelty than the other divisions, we come to the models. These are of varied excellence and badness. The best are by Locchi (Turin: Paravia), showing the regions about Rome and Naples in true vertical scale. The largest relief in the collection is sent by the same enterprising publisher; it is of Italy, by Cherubini, measuring nearly six by seven feet. Its vertical exaggeration is five-fold, and for this reason we wish that Paravia had sent the Pomba relief of Italy instead, because it is without vertical exaggeration, and especially because it is represented on a curved surface, thus giving not only true local relief, but also the true convexity of the earth, by which many interesting lessons can be taught. In this respect it is infinitely better than the vicious exaggerations of relief globes. We miss with regret the artistic models by Heim (Zurich: Wurster). Most of the other models are on too small a scale or of too rough workmanship to be considered seriously; those of this country are generally needlessly exaggerated. The mountain ranges on Frye's continents are so simplified as to be misleading even for elementary teaching. A certain audacious relief model "showing all the forms of land and water," by Hindshaw (London: Philip), is simply abominable in its absurdity. None of the continental models are as finely prepared as those made by the Mendeliefs for Butler's geographies, and these are unfortunately not on exhibition. King's useful models of Wisconsin are also wanting.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For want of space we can do no more than name a few of the pictures, books, and atlases. *Facile princeps* among the pictures are the "Geographische Characterbilder," published by Hölzel of Vienna. It is simply a matter of expense whether our high schools can get these works of art; there is nothing else nearly as good. They are all in colors, carefully prepared from the best originals that could be procured, and some are truly elegant in accuracy of expression and artistic finish. Our Shoshone waterfall, the hot springs of New Zealand, the glaciers of Switzerland, the plains of Hungary, Table Mountain behind Cape Town, and Kintchinjunga in the Himalaya, deserve particular mention. Several other series of illustrations are also exhibited, but none can approach these of Hölzel's. Of atlases, there are twelve or more of the best quality; one should examine them with care if he intends purchasing for a library, but the Institute has been over-generous in allowing these valuable books to be handled indiscriminately by all comers. In the subsequent exhibitions, the books should be railed off, and be accessible only to responsible persons who give their names and addresses. Text-books, readers, guides, and methods are in large number, forming a most satisfactory collection for examination by teachers.

It may be of service to mention that the officers on the Committee on the Exhibition are Mr. Cyrus C. Adams, Chairman, and Mr. W. S. T. B. Imlay, Secretary. Either of these gentlemen may be addressed, in care of the Brooklyn Institute, regarding the further exhibition of their collection.

LONDON ARCHIVES OF AMERICAN HISTORY.

LONDON, January 15, 1891.

THE student of American history who seeks in London for the sources of early Anglo-American annals is not content with the incomparable collection of books and manuscripts in the British Museum and in the Public Record Office, or in other repositories which the Historical Manuscripts Commission have made known, but he must seek to complement these with several other collections, hardly ever resorted to but by the eager student, and with little return sometimes then. These are the library of the Archiepiscopal Palace at Lambeth, the library of the Bishop of London at Fulham, that of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts in Delahay Street, and that of the old society now known as the New England Company.

It may interest your readers to know something of the distinctive qualities of each of these minor repositories. While the collection at Lambeth dates back to 1610, when it was first started by Archbishop Bancroft, its collection of about 30,000 volumes is not of peculiar interest to the American inquirer. There are some early books of the seventeenth century, relating to New England and Virginia, but none of them are such as the well-equipped American scholar is not familiar with. I took pains to look at some of them, including a large-paper copy of Capt. Smith's 'Virginia' and Lechford's 'Plain Dealing,' in the hopes that I might find some contemporary MS. notes in them, but I was disappointed. There was a loose copy, in very excellent condition, of Smith's 'Map of New England' (1616) in an early condition of the plate; but there was nothing written on it, except some ciphering, very likely to sum up some merchant's ventures in sending trinkets to the New England coast.

The manuscripts at Lambeth are of more importance, but pretty much everything, I think, has been gleaned from them by students of the early history of the American Church, like Dr. Hawkes and Bishop Perry. The chief consecutive interest of the papers consists in the correspondence of the Archbishop of Canterbury and of the Bishop of Oxford, in the eighteenth century, with leading Episcopalians in the Colonies, either in relation to the interests of the Church there, or to the establishing of colleges in the same interests in New York and Philadelphia. So we find numerous letters from the Rev. Samuel Johnson, who became the President of King's College, now Columbia College, in New York, and whose honorable career has been so well told in a recent life by Dr. Baird, who, no doubt, was able to avail himself of all the material here. I saw one letter from Sir Harry Frankland, of Agnes Surriage memory, who described the condition of feeling in Boston in those days when the revolutionary spirit was yet in embryo; and numerous letters from such men as Timothy Cutler, who, having distressed Yale College on the question of Episcopal influence, came to Boston, and was not any better liked by the adherents of Harvard College when he tried to secure a hand in its management. There were also letters of Caner, the rector of King's Chapel in Boston. Some of these men sent extracts from letters of their opponents, and in that way we read something from the pens of Cotton Mather and Thomas Prince. An interesting letter from Jonathan Edwards, describing his methods of dealing with Indian neophytes at Stockbridge, would have interested his latest and best biographer, Prof. Allen, if, indeed, it had not already been brought to his attention. A letter from a Philadelphia Quaker, Anthony Benezet, in 1762, is of interest as an earnest protest against the slave trade. The severance of the Colonies from all connection with the English Church is prefigured in a communication to the Archbishop from Cutler and others, enclosing a petition to George the Third, urging the sending of bishops to America, and in the endorsement on it, that, in the then existing state of public opinion in the Colonies, it was not deemed wise to force an issue on that question, and so the petition was withheld. This was in 1761, the period when the discussion on the writs of assistance was going to give a rallying cry to the incipient party of patriots.

Connected with this class of papers are a number of papers on the Andros side in the controversy which ended in the collapse of that governor's administration in New England; but I suspect that Mr. Whitmore has availed himself of all of them in his edition of the Andros Tracts.

Outside of this class of manuscripts, we find something relating to the voyages of Sir Francis Drake and Sir Walter Raleigh, and one or two interesting papers on early arctic exploration and on the northwest passage by John Guy and William Morgan. The most important is a statement of what happened in Jamestown, Virginia, after the departure of Newport in 1607—quite within the range of Mr. Alexander Brown's 'Genesis of the United States,' and doubtless not unknown to that assiduous student. The later voyage of Henry Fleet to the Virginia waters has, I suppose, been already illustrated in print from the original MSS. which I find here.

The visitor at Fulham and to the library of the Bishop of London turns first to that manuscript 'History of Plymouth Plantation,' by its second leader Gov. Bradford, which in some way, probably because of the headship which the Bishop of this metropolitan see sustained over the American churches, found its way to Fulham at a time not long after, it would seem, some British officer bore it away—if, indeed, Hutchinson himself was not the bearer—after the opening of the war of independence. There is no occasion to repeat here the story which follows the strange vicissitudes of that manuscript—the corner-stone as it is of our New England history—till it was fortuitously brought to light and was printed by the Massachusetts Historical Society under the editing of the late Dr. Charles Deane in 1856. When Mr. Motley left Boston to undertake his mission at the Court of St. James, he asked me one day what he could do in London to further the interests of American history. I replied, "Get the Bradford manuscript returned to us." He later wrote to me from London that, with the Beaconsfield Government in power, it was not at all sure that an attempt to secure the passage of a bill through Parliament would be promising enough for the effort which it would require. A few years later, being in London, I went to Fulham; but, missing the Bishop, he later opened a correspondence with me respecting the MS., in which he regretted that his own power in the premises was not sufficient to make the surrender. This was Dr. Jackson, the late Bishop, who promised to interpose no objection if ever a bill was introduced into Parliament. Here the matter has since rested, and I have never felt that it was desirable to press the question, deeming that the precious document was quite as well off where it is as to make it the subject of contention as to whom it should be given to. The fact is, that the book itself shows that it was only deposited in the Prince Library, and the heirs of Gov. Bradford never yielded their property in it. To return it to private custody in America does not seem to me desirable. The claim of the Prince Library, or the Boston Public Library, through their trusteeship of the Prince Library, which doubtless had possession of it at the time it was abstracted and sent to England, has no validity that Parliament could recognize; and any surrender on the part of Parliament would most likely be in favor of the Government of the United States, which would bring the treasure into the custody of the State Department or of the Library of Congress, in neither of which places, in the present arrangements at Washington, would an historical student like to see it. Therefore one looks upon it at Fulham as not altogether in a place unfitting for it, for its value is not unknown by those in charge of it.

There is in the muniment room at Fulham a large mass of papers relating to the times when the Episcopal Church in the American colonies was within the jurisdiction of the see of London. I saw them some years ago, covered with dust, tied up in packages, and stuffed away in large bins surrounding the room. They are now in the same condition, only with a dozen years' more accumulation of dust upon them. It is utterly impossible to give them any examination at present. They not unlikely go back to the time when it was attempted without success by Popham and Gorges to establish Episcopacy on the New England coast long before the Separatists of the *Mayflower* began a successful settlement, and I suppose that the papers came down to a period when the war of independence put an end to the oversight of the Bishop. That they may have been in some part used by Bishop Wilberforce and by Anderson, forty or fifty years ago, in their essays to write the history of the Ameri-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can Church, is quite possible, and some share of their present disarrangement may be due to the efforts of those writers to make researches among the papers. I am glad to learn that the present Bishop is sensible of their importance to American students of history, and is intending to have them arranged and bound. It is hoped that this may be accomplished in three or four years.

In the building in Delahay Street, close by the Government offices, there is every symptom of an active business agency, pertaining to the administration of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. Beginning in 1701, the Anglo-American colonies held no small share of the attention of this body in their effort to convert the native red man of America; and their long series of printed reports, with the much more extended reports in manuscript which they preserve, together with the original correspondence of their missionaries, furnished in the first instance the materials for Humphrey's history of their missions to 1730, and for Canon Hawkins's continuation down to 1785, which was published in 1851. For Humphrey's book, Herman Moll, the leading English geographer of his day, made some maps which the student of American geography as it was understood in the early part of the last century finds useful; and he would particularly like to collate the maps, sent home by the missionaries, upon which that cartographer worked. That there was such a collection of drawn maps the records of the Society show; but I find that all trace of them has been lost. The manuscript records of the society and their accompanying original papers begin in 1702, though there are occasional papers of a much earlier date—I noticed, for instance, a copy of a record regarding Harvard College dated in 1642—kept on their files in attested copies of the eighteenth century. These original papers refer in large part to Massachusetts, to New England as a whole, and to New York; and numerous volumes stand on their shelves, of dates running from 1702 to 1784, at or before which last date the Society withdrew its missionaries as being no longer in British territory. American students, as I have said, like Dr. Hawkes, Bishop Perry, and, working in a more secular way, Dr. Edward Eggleston, have in the past found the officers of the Society quite ready to welcome them to these treasures. I am glad to say that the present librarian is now engaged on a digest of such of their early records as relate in particular to their American labors, and it will not be long before the student can profit by his results in print.

Another kindred society, but unfortunately without documentary annals of like value to the American historian, is one which now passes under the name of the New England Company. It originated in 1644, in the Long Parliament, under the title of "A Corporation for the Promoting and Propagating the Gospel of Jesus Christ in New England," and it was under its patronage and that of its successor that the labors of Eliot, the Indian apostle, were made conspicuous, and such publications as what are known as the Eliot tracts and the Indian Bible and other versions of religious books were in part made possible. The Restoration in 1660 of course put an end to all ministrations which the Puritan Parliament had instituted; but the desirableness of the work which the society had done was not questioned, and it took a new lease of life two years later, by virtue of an act of Charles's first Parliament, and went on with its work under the style of "The Company for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England and in Parts Adjacent in America." The successful outcome of the Declaration of Independence debarred their action within the new republic; and, after remaining at rest for some years, their agencies again moved, and the province of New Brunswick was made their field, as being still "in parts adjacent to New England." The dying out of the Indians in that region drove them to more remote fields, and they are now expending about £3,500 a year on missions in Ontario and British Columbia.

There are efforts now making at Guildhall in the "City" which will be of interest to the American genealogist and student of English municipalities. This latter subject has not escaped the attention of American students, and the English workers in the same field recognize the importance of Dr. Gross's recent book on the English guilds. I find this new book on the counter at Bain's—perhaps on the whole the book-shop in London most resorted to by the reading class of the higher stamp; I see it on the ledges at the Athenæum Club, and it was lying on the table in the Committee-room of the Guildhall Library when I was there yesterday. The movement to which I refer is the gathering in the Guildhall Library of the records—not in immediate use—of the parishes and wards of the "City." It will take some time, doubtless, to bring the efforts to a conclusion, and to reconcile the present guardians of these records to the transfer; but a sort of Public Record Office for the "City," somewhat equivalent to that of the Government offices, is certainly desirable. There were a great many Londoners among the early settlers of New England, and one finds local names in our villages that tell how these Londoners had the art of comparing small things with great. In two contiguous villages on the Massachusetts Coast, there is a brook called to this day Hound's Ditch, and a neighborhood called Wapping.

JUSTIN WINSOR.

Correspondence.

INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I trust that you will allow me a small space to comment on the article "Law and Theft" which appeared in your paper of February 12. Reference is there made to a short article of mine which I was asked to write, and which I believe has appeared in more than one American newspaper. The writer of "Law and Theft" has altogether misunderstood what I said in that article.

The writer of "Law and Theft" seems very fond of saying that I have confounded things. I have "confounded the question of right with the question of security"; I have "confounded plagiarism and piracy." Now, I have not confounded anything; I have only distinguished things that the writer confounds.

His whole argument against me goes on a misconception of what I have said. He begins by saying that I hold that "all property, and especially literary property, is the creation of law." This is his first confusion. I have said nothing about "literary property"; I have avoided the words, because they are likely to lead to the confusion into which the writer of "Law and Theft" has fallen. Because I hold that a certain privilege, which may, in a certain secondary sense, be called "literary property," is the artificial creation of law, he thinks that I hold that all property is the creation of law. He attributes this doctrine to me more than once. But I have said nothing of the kind, either in the paper to which he objects or anywhere else. I have not gone into the origin of property, which is much too hard a question for me. I have simply said that copyright is not what one may call natural property, like a man's goods and clothes, but that it is, what it certainly is, an artificial privilege granted by law. One main object of government is the protection of what one may call natural property. One might even say, though it would be rather dangerous to say it, that governments were called into being in order to protect such property. But one certainly cannot say that governments were called into being in order to protect copyright. Copyright is not likely to be thought of till governments have been in being for ages; it is a privilege which, in certain advanced states of society, it is just and expedient that governments should grant to their subjects or citizens; but it is an artificial privilege all the same. The difference between the natural right and the artificial privilege is obvious. A man is held justifiable, in all times and places, in using physical force to hinder another man from taking his purse out of his pocket. In no time or place could he be held justifiable in going into a "pirate's" printing-office and hindering him by physical force from printing a book of his writing. For the privilege infringed by the pirate is the creation of law, and the sufferer must go to the law for his remedy. The right infringed by the highwayman is a right older than law; the wronged man has, therefore, if law is not ready to help him at the moment, to make use of a remedy older than law.

The writer of "Law and Theft" seems not to see this distinction. He therefore charges me with "confounding right and security," and puts into my mouth the proposition which I have nowhere maintained, that all property is the "creation of law." He goes on to put into my mouth another proposition, which also I have never maintained, namely, that "it is highly indecent to speak of persons who publish other men's works without paying for them as 'thieves and pirates.'" What I did say was, that it was neither becoming nor truthful to apply such names as "thieves" and "robbers"—I said nothing about "pirates"—to the House of Representatives of the United States, or to any other legislative body in any country, on account of any measures which it may pass or refuse to pass on the subject of copyright. It did not come into my thoughts that the House of Representatives could be held to come under the head of "persons who publish other men's works without paying for them."

The writer of "Law and Theft" further says that I "confound plagiarism and piracy." I do no such thing. "Plagiarism" and "piracy" are both of them words which imply an odd metaphor; but I will take both of them as they are commonly used. By a "plagiarist" I understand a man who publishes another man's writings under his own name. By a "pirate" I understand a man who publishes another man's writings with the real author's name, but who gives the real author no share of the money which he makes by publishing them. The "plagiarist" lessens the real author's reputation; he makes a false reputation for himself at the cost of another man. The "pirate," if his edition be accurate, spreads the reputation of the author; he simply omits to give him money. Now, as I hold reputation to be higher than money, my worst complaint against pirates is that their editions are not accurate. An American publisher once reprinted my little book, 'General Sketch of European History.' I forget whether he paid

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

me any money or not—that is, I forget whether he was a "pirate" or not; but in either case he did me a much worse wrong than any mere omission to pay me money. For he changed the title of the book into 'Outlines of History.' That is, he did me a wrong by changing my title at all; he did me a worse wrong by changing a title which described the objects of the book into a title which did not describe them. Does not the author of "Law and Theft" see that, if the pirate printed my book as I wrote it, he only omitted to give me something? And, in the case of an American citizen, the obligation to give me anything could arise only out of the law of the United States. But the obligation to print my book as I wrote it, if he printed it at all, was an obligation older than the law of the United States, older than the law of Solon or Moses. By changing my correct title into an incorrect one, he did take something from me: he did a damage to my reputation; he represented me as describing my book in a way that was not truthful; he represented me as promising All History and giving only European History. And by changing either the title or any other word in the book, even supposing every change was an improvement, he was guilty of falsehood by representing me as saying something which I had not said.

There is really no practical difference of opinion on the subject of copyright between me and the writer of the article "Law and Theft." If I rightly understand him, he holds, exactly as I hold, that it is just and expedient that all governments should grant the privilege of copyright both to their own citizens and to strangers. I set forth that position as strongly and clearly as I knew how in the little article to which he objects. He and I have got to the same conclusion by different roads; that is all, only I think my road is the best, because it is the path of fact. While he thinks that I have confounded this and that, I think that he has confounded several things which I have distinguished. Both the propositions which he puts into my mouth are propositions which I have never made. The practical conclusion that I proposed was, that Great Britain and the United States should each grant to the subjects or citizens of the other Power such privileges in the matter of copyright as are, by its own law for the time being, enjoyed by its own subjects or citizens. Does not that satisfy the author of "Law and Theft"? It is hard to see what more can be asked for on either side. Only with that proposal I joined, and I still must join, the comment that, if the Legislature of either country should refuse to grant such privileges, that Legislature is not therefore to be spoken of as a "House of Thieves."

—I am, sir, your obedient servant,

EDWARD A. FREEMAN.

OXFORD, February 27, 1891.

[If Mr. Freeman does not think all property the creation of law, what does this passage from his original letter to the Philadelphia *Press* mean?

"Now, it is very hard to say what natural right is. Philosophers have often disputed over that point. But roughly and practically, a man may be fairly said to have a natural right to his life, and to his property lawfully gained—always remembering that what is a lawful way of gaining property in one country may not be so in another. Every one expects, both in his own country and in any other, that the supreme power of the State will hinder anybody but itself from taking his life or property, and that it will not itself take them except by legal process.

"Can it be that what is called 'copyright' is a natural right in anything like this sense? Copyright means that when a man has published any writing, all other people are to be hindered from publishing that writing without his consent. Now this surely is not a natural right, but a very artificial privilege, one which could only have been thought of in a very artificial state of things. It cannot be said to be a natural right in the same sense as the safety of a man's life or of his house. It cannot be said that the supreme power, either of my own country or of any other, is as obviously bound to hinder people from reprinting the 'History of the Norman Conquest' against my will as it is obviously bound to hinder me from being knocked on the head, or robbed on the highway, as long as I am under its jurisdiction. One would say, that if there is any natural right at all in so very artificial a matter, every one has a *prima facie* right to publish what he chooses. That right the law of any country may wisely and justly restrain. But surely the mere natural right is on that side rather than on the other."

We see here that although "natural right" is something difficult to define, we nevertheless need not hesitate to say that a man's natural right to his property can only cover property "lawfully gained," that is, gained in the way prescribed as lawful in the particular country in which he gains it. There is a statute of William III. which authorized any Protestant meeting a Catholic in Ireland riding a horse worth more than five pounds, to take the horse from him and become its owner, on tendering five pounds. In this case the law simply withdrew its protection from the Catholic's property in the horse when the five pounds were tendered; but did "the natural right" to the horse pass over, *ipso facto*, to the Protestant? In like manner, in this country, before emancipation, negroes were hired out as servants in great numbers to other people by their owners, and the owners pocketed the wages. Who had the natural right to the wages in these cases, the slave or the owner? The State withheld its protection from the negro's wages; did not the negro thereby lose also his natural right to them?

In admitting that the State has the right to say in what manner a man must become possessed of a thing in order to make it legal property, Mr. Freeman really concedes what we contend for. He really holds that all property has a legal origin. We hold, on the contrary, that property has a moral origin, and that the fruits of a man's labor and self-restraint are property whether the State protects them or not, or whether there exists a State to protect them or not. They are his property in the desert or in mid-ocean, in London or in Timbuctoo, provided that in acquiring them he has "lived uprightly, hurt nobody, and given every man his due."

As to the argument that copyright is not a natural right, but "a very artificial privilege" which "could only have been thought of in a very artificial state of things," we answer that this argument would also cover bills of exchange. That bills of exchange are property, and that forging the payee's name on the back of one of them is a crime, and a very serious crime, are propositions which only a high state of civilization could produce. They would be rejected as absurd by barbarians. The advance of civilization is constantly producing new forms of property, but the title by which the owner holds them is always the same. It is not in the smallest degree shaken by the refusal or neglect of the State to provide protection for them. Life, Mr. Freeman says, is "a natural right." But the law in ancient Rome allowed, as in modern China, a father to decide whether he would rear his children or allow them to perish. Did the child lose its "natural right" to existence because the father could murder it with legal impunity?

The law is as obviously bound in the forum of morals to hinder people from reprinting and selling Mr. Freeman's 'History of the Norman Conquest' as it is obviously bound to hinder him from being knocked on the head or robbed on the highway, as long as he is under its jurisdiction. Mr. Freeman's use of the term "bound" shows that he is conscious that in matters of this sort the law, too, acts under the rule of duty, or, in other words, that it is constrained by a higher power; that in providing or refusing protection it is subject to other considerations than mere prejudice or convenience.

Mr. Freeman's notion, expressed in another part of his letter, that an argument against a man's natural right to his books is to be found in the fact that no author thinks of defending himself by force against "piracy," as he would defend himself against attempts to murder or rob him, is a striking illustration of the confusion wrought in this discussion by the novelty of literary property. The reason why authors do not resist piracy, club or pistol in hand, as they would resist burglary or murder, is simply that they are an exceedingly small body, and are generally men of sedentary habits and peaceable disposition—not that they are insensible to the wrong done them by the sale, for other men's profit, of the product of their industry. As authors worth pirating they are in every country a class containing a few hundred individuals, while as owners of other kinds of property they belong to a class which comprises the whole population, except paupers and thieves. To ask authors, therefore, why, if they think their books are property like other property, they do not defend it *vi et armis*, as they would, in the absence of police, defend their watches and money, is to ask why the customs of a community are settled by ninety-nine-hundredths of its members and not by the remaining one-hundredth.

How large a part the ambiguous and deceptive use of words plays in this discussion is also illustrated by Mr. Freeman's observation, in the above quotation, that "one would say if there is any natural right at all in so very artificial a matter, every one has a primâ-facie right to publish what he chooses." Now, the snare in this sentence lies in the word "publish." The term, as used by authors and literary men, means simply to make known certain facts or ideas to the world through a printed book or pamphlet. This is undoubtedly the sense in which Mr. Freeman uses it here, for in another part of his letter he says: "Primâ facie, a man who reprints an author's book is doing him a service; he is increasing the circulation of the book and its means of doing good." In this sense, too, the Pirates use it when they

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

deny the existence of "property in ideas," and maintain that the conceptions of an author's brain are or ought to be the common property of his fellow-men, open to appropriation by all for the general improvement of the species. It was in this sense that Dr. Crosby used it when he came to the defence of the Rev. Dr. Funk, then engaged in "publishing" a stolen edition of the 'Encyclopædia Britannica.' But when used in the discussion of the question of copyright, it means the sale of an author's work at a price which will cover the cost of mechanical production and yield a profit to the vendor.

When a Pirate is contemplating the theft of a book, he does not say, "Shall I by reprinting this work add to the author's fame, and contribute to the higher happiness of my fellow-men, and assist poor boys in getting their education more cheaply?" He says simply, "How much money would there be in this venture for me? Let me see"—and he takes his pencil and figures on cost of production and probable sales, and discusses with his partners the chance of some other Pirate getting into the market before him. So that what we mean when we deny the right of Pirates to "publish" other men's books is that we deny their right to sell the fruits of another man's industry in open market without his consent, *and in competition with him.* Piracy does not mean spreading abroad a man's ideas or his fame, or using him in any sense for the good of humanity. It means treating as vendible property in the Pirate's hands a thing which the Pirate has taken from the author on the plea that it could not be vendible property in his hands, and answering his remonstrances by showing him that for this particular wrong there is no legal remedy. That authors have listened to this defence so long without a single resort to violence proves to us, not that they are conscious of possessing no moral right to what their brain has coined or their industry collected, but that they are a small, pacific, long-suffering, physically delicate, and singularly non-gregarious body of men.—Ed. Nation.]

THE EFFECT OF THE COPYRIGHT ACT.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Referring to your remarks on the working of the Copyright Act, will you permit me to show why some of your views seem to me incorrect? In the first place, the *Nation*, in common with all other American literary journals, greatly exaggerates the importance of the bill, considered otherwise than as an expression of moral obligation. The only effect of the bill for ten years, at least, will be to increase, in a small degree, the profits of a few novelists like Mrs. Maxwell and Mr. Haggard, and of a few writers in the magazines whose articles are read chiefly on account of their authors' celebrity in other fields. The increase in the novelists' profits will be small, first because they already (especially since the rise of the syndicate system) receive considerable sums for serial rights, and secondly because the sale will be greatly decreased. People who, twenty years ago, never bought novels, but borrowed them from circulating libraries, have, since such works became everywhere accessible in convenient shape and at a low price, bought them almost to as large an extent as they formerly borrowed them. Such works, now sold to dealers at seven cents (with almost no expense for freight) and retailed at twenty-five cents at railway stands and at seventeen cents in large shops, will hereafter cost (say) fifty cents, while, owing to the absence of competition, the discount (and incidentally the ability to keep on sale a considerable stock, including the better as well as the worse class of books) will be lessened. The novel-reading public, meanwhile, will be driven either to lending-libraries or to reading other than *new* books by well-known authors.

It is, however, the position of authors who are not well known which I wish to consider. You say that "the foreign author will be in exactly the same position towards the American publisher as that now occupied by the American author." Is this true? A native author offers his book to a publisher who refuses it; he then offers it to a second, a third, or a tenth publisher, and finally it is accepted. Obviously the publishing interests at home of a foreign author will not allow the delay necessary for negotiations occupying, as these would, several months. Moreover, a work may have eventual pecuniary value, but not be immediately available; in such a case the native author merely postpones publication, while with the foreigner it is now or never.

I think the supply of cheap reprints will be as large as now, though the average merit will be less. He who wishes to read William Black or Mrs. Oliphant will have to inconvenience himself somewhat, but a new 'Robert Elsmere' would be as cheap as under the present system, because no publisher will take risks on an author without a reputation when he can reprint nineteen books out of twenty without payment. Out of the ten novels published weekly in Great Britain, it is improbable that an effort even will be made to place more than one in this country, so there is no fear that a plentiful supply of cheap fiction—such as it is—will be lacking.

The chances for unknown authors of works of scholarship are, of course, even less favorable, because the costs of production are greater, and facilities for distribution smaller. As to this class of authors, you remark that "the alternative of publishing the book at his expense is, it is true, open to him, but it will also be open to the unknown foreign author." From the casual way in which you mention the matter, one would suppose that publishing at the author's expense was an unusual proceeding, whereas I believe it to be, with works of scholarship, very common; and the historian or man of science who might be able to afford one set of plates (and that, probably, for the professional rather than the pecuniary rewards which are possible) would find the cost of a second set out of the question.

W: M. G.

THE RAIMONDI COLLECTIONS.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The Peruvian Government has decided to sell the large and valuable collections and accompanying manuscripts of the late Prof. Antonio Raimondi. Raimondi was enthusiastically devoted to the interests of science and of his adopted country—so much so that he left his family in straitened circumstances. His great ambition was to publish a complete treatise on the geography, geology, and natural history of Peru. He spent nineteen years in the interior of the country, enduring hardships and perils which would have appalled a less enthusiastic man, and accumulated a vast amount of material for his work. He then spent many more years of constant labor, arranging his collections and preparing for the publication of his researches.

The Peruvian Government made a contract with him to this end, but the war with Chili rendered it impossible to carry out this and other contracts. Only the three preliminary volumes of 'Peru' have been printed, but some separate publications have appeared, such as the description of the Department of Ancachs, which Henry Meiggs paid for. The map of Peru, on the scale of twenty-two centimetres to the degree, will consist of thirty-four sheets, of which eleven are published, two more are in the hands of the engravers, and the rest are all drawn.

Raimondi sold his collections to the Government for 50,000 soles (Peruvian dollars), on condition that they should belong to the School of Medicine. A museum was to be erected for these collections and named the "Museo Raimondi." The designs of the building have been approved, and the ground has been bought, but only the laboratory has been built. The School is now without sufficient funds to replace the fine library and anatomical collections which were destroyed by the Chilians, and hence is compelled to part with Raimondi's collections in order to provide for its more direct needs. These collections are now offered for the price at which Raimondi sold them.

Mr. Ernest Malinowski, the distinguished engineer of Peru, writes me that for these collections some years ago parties in the United States made offers which amounted to $100,000, besides agreeing to pay the expenses of publishing Raimondi's works. On account of a sentiment of exaggerated delicacy and of extreme modesty, Raimondi was reluctant to speak of these offers. For this reason, and as the papers of the deceased are now under seal, Mr. Malinowski does not know what parties made the offers. Prof. Louis Agassiz strongly urged Raimondi to come to the United States, and during the war with Chili the Italian Government invited him to go to Italy (his native land), and offered to take charge of the publication of the rest of his work. But Raimondi would not abandon Peru.

Concerning the collections, of which Raimondi left an inventory, Mr. Malinowski writes:

"I understand that the herbarium is classified and arranged in a series of books expressly ordered from France. The collection of 652 mineral specimens sent to the Paris Exposition of 1868 was returned, and is described [in *Los Minerales del Peru*, Lima, 1878]. There is also a large collection of minerals in boxes, each specimen properly labelled, and with the collection are given more than 4,000 analyses. Under the direction of Mr. [Loui-] Agassiz, the fossils were classified by Mr. Gabb. The birds and some of the animals have been classified by Prof. [?], late Director of the Museum at Warsaw; the classification has been published."

I have asked Mr. Malinowski to send me a general description of the collections. Meantime I wish to call attention to the fact that these collections are for sale at what appears to be a very low price, and also that an opportunity is offered to make a valuable contribution to scientific knowledge. Should any parties wish to investigate the matter, it might be possible to obtain a report on the collections from the members of the Harvard Astronomical Expedition now in Peru.

A. D. Hodges, Jr.

Boston, March 19, 1891.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"THE CANADIAN ELECTIONS."

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: As a Canadian subscriber to the *Nation*, I think it proper to point out to you, and through you to the readers of that journal, that the statements contained in the editorial item on the above subject, published in your issue of the 12th instant, are in great part, if not wholly, erroneous and misleading. In the first place, it is stated "that the elections have resulted in a practical defeat of Sir John Macdonald and the Conservative party." Now, so far from this being true, Sir John Macdonald's Government and the Conservative party have been sustained in their recent appeal to the people by a majority of 33 or 35, which is about as large as that they received at the last previous election in 1887. In the Provinces of British Columbia and Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, no change whatever has taken place in the comparative strength of the two political parties in the House of Commons, as the result of the recent election. In the Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island, the Conservative party has at the recent general election made a net gain of eight seats; while, as against this, it has in the other two Provinces of Ontario and Quebec made a net loss of not more than ten seats. These are the results of the election of 1891, as compared with those of the appeal to the people in 1887. Where, then, I would ask, is the practical defeat; and what, taking the Dominion as a whole, are the serious losses the Conservative party has sustained?

The other statements in the editorial in question as to the result of the elections showing the unpopularity of the Conservative protective policy; also, that the cry of "annexation" was raised by Sir John Macdonald to save this protective policy, and that the people of Canada had rebuked the Government party for contending that if unrestricted reciprocity were adopted, Canada would lose control of her tariff legislation—are of an equally mistaken and misleading character. I do not desire now to take up time and space by entering in detail into the discussion suggested by these statements, but merely to say, as to the "national policy," as our protective policy is called, that it was not condemned by the people of Canada, as shown by the result of the recent elections. The few counties which the Opposition gained in Ontario and Quebec on their policy of "unrestricted reciprocity" with the United States were frontier counties, and were so gained by reason of the immediate prejudicial effect upon the farmers in these constituencies, as they believed, of the high duties imposed under the McKinley tariff on such natural products as horses, hay, barley, eggs, etc., in which they were largely interested; and from the fact that the farmers were led to believe by the Opposition party that Sir John Macdonald was in some way responsible for the imposition of these high duties, and that only by getting unrestricted reciprocity, which the Opposition alone could obtain for the country, would it be possible to get rid of these objectionable duties.

As to the statement that "the cry of annexation" was raised by Sir John Macdonald to save the "national policy," such was not the case; but annexation to the United States was pointed out by him as the inevitable result, in his opinion, of a policy that would transfer the control of our customs tariff to the United States, and take away half of our annual revenue necessary to meet our annual expenditure. Whether the writer of the item in question believes so or not, there can be but little doubt in the mind of any one who has studied the question that the adoption by Canada of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, as proposed by the Opposition party in Canada, must result in the first place in Canada losing control of her customs tariff, and in no long time thereafter in the absorption of Canada politically by the United States. Against these results Sir John Macdonald warned the people of Canada, and, acting upon his advice, instead of "rebuking" him, the electors by a large majority "rebuked" the Opposition leaders for embracing the unpatriotic policy of unrestricted reciprocity.

Considering that Sir John Macdonald's Government had already been in power continuously for over twelve years, and had been three times during these twelve years sustained on appeal to the people, and that they had against them, actively fighting them in this election, the whole force of the Provincial Governments of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, and Manitoba, and that such a plausible appeal was made to the farming community by the Opposition, the majority obtained by Sir John's Government is the strongest evidence possible of the soundness of his policy, and of the loyalty of the people of Canada to their own country, their Constitution, and their Queen.

A. Ferguson.

Ottawa, Canada, March 16, 1891.

A WOMAN IN OFFICE.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: It will surely interest your readers outside of the State of Missouri to learn that here, in Jasper County, Mo., we have made a new departure in the distribution of county offices. While we have not as yet adopted woman suffrage pure and simple, we have established the eligibility of women for public office, by electing a lady to the important office of County Clerk at the election held last November. The distinguished example of our political tolerance is Mrs. Annie Baxter, who was nominated on the Democratic ticket for the office which she had previously managed as Deputy. It was a clear case of civil-service reform, advancing a worthy Deputy to the first place.

The nomination of a lady, owing to the novelty of the case, took a great many voters by surprise. The matter was privately and openly warmly discussed; there was no precedent. As to Mrs. Baxter's qualification, there was no dissenting voice, since she had acquired ample experience during several years' service as Deputy Clerk. Likewise all acknowledged her tact and the accommodating ways by which she had won numerous friends independent of party feelings. But was it opportune to jeopardize the chances of electing a Democrat to the office by paying a compliment to a lady Democrat? And could she hold office if elected? The latter question was decided in the affirmative by a carefully drawn opinion of leading lawyers, as had been done before when Mrs. Baxter was first appointed Deputy. At the election she was successful by a large majority; the Governor in due time signed her commission, and the defeated male candidate on the Republican ticket served notice of a contest, which will be decided in court next March.

The impending contest aroused the enthusiasm of the lady's supporters; the press of the State took up the case and decided the contest in advance of the court, bestowed the title of colonel on Mrs. Baxter, and heaped ridicule and scorn on the unfortunate Republican contesting candidate. The Democratic Mayor of a little town, in his enthusiasm, even registered one of his brood sows under the lady's name, erecting in this way to the liberal nominating convention a monument "ære perennius."

Curiously enough, the reason why the election of a woman for that office was deemed at least not opportune, was that in case bonds should be voted for the building of a court-house, the bonds countersigned by a lady Clerk might be looked upon as doubtful, and their placing on the market made difficult. Jasper County has had no court-house since the war, and all attempts so far to raise money for the building of one have failed because the farmers fight shy of bonds—for good reasons, with which I will not detain you. A.

CONNECTION OF THE ENGLISH WASHINGTONS.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I notice, in Mr. Conway's letter on the early Washingtons in Virginia, the statement that the families of the name in Yorkshire and those in Northamptonshire existed in England for centuries separate and distinct, without any known link of kinship. I do not wish to dispute Mr. Conway's assertion; but, nevertheless, I think it well to remark that a connection between the two families is shown by the pedigrees given in Plantagenete-Harrison's 'History of Yorkshire'—how correctly I am unable to say.

The links are as follows: From Bonde, lord of Washington, in co. York *tempore* King Stephen, descended Robert Washington of co. Westmoreland, who had a descendant Robert Washington of co. Lancaster, whose descendant, Robert, founded the Northampton Washingtons from whom came our President, though not by Mr. Harrison's line, but by that discovered by Mr. Waters and corroborated by Mr. Conway. C.

March 21, 1891.

THE GREENES OF GREEN'S NORTON, ENGLAND.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: In your issue of October 11, 1888, you published a "Simple Tale" from the pen of the late Dr. Beal, Rector of the parish of Green's Norton, telling of the fearful state of the monument and brasses belonging to the Greene family, and asking if any of the descendants who might be in America would be willing to help to put them in decent order; to which various members responded. I crave your kind permission to state that the restoration of the entire church is now commenced, for which the large sum of £2,600 is required, and to which the Queen has given £50. In the present state of our funds, we do not feel justified (much as we should wish it) in restoring the monument and brasses in such a manner as we should desire, unless we receive special donations for the purpose. The sum of £50 would do what is required, and I earnestly ask for that sum from those most interested in preserving their history and records of the past. I may add that already, in removing some plaster from the walls, various coats of arms of the Greene family have been found painted on the stonework as also on portions of the tomb.

Thanking you, in anticipation, for the insertion of this letter, in aid of a much needed work, and hoping that, through the wide cir-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

culation of your paper, it may reach the eye of those it most concerns,

I am, sir, yours faithfully,

R. A. KENNAWAY, Rector.

GREEN'S NORTON, TOWCESTER, ENGLAND, March 16, 1891.

TALLEYRAND AND THERAMENES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your correspondent last week, writing from Paris on the lately published memoirs of Talleyrand, recalled the words, in the declaration added to his will, that in all his political life he had abandoned none of the governments which he had served before it had abandoned itself. The newly discovered treatise on the 'Athenian State' affords a striking parallel in the judgment which Aristotle passes upon Theramenes. The ancient and the modern statesman each held office under three fundamentally different forms of government, and the modern was never more cordially hated by his opponents than the ancient, whose political nickname was the "Buskin"—the shoe that fits either foot. Talleyrand has spoken in his own behalf. Of Theramenes Aristotle (chap. xxviii) says:

"Men of more than superficial judgment do not believe that he was a professional destroyer of all governments, as his detractors say, but rather that he supported all as long as they did not outrage the law; for he was a man who could live under any form of government—and this is behaving like a good citizen—but who was the foe, not the tool, of governments that went beyond the laws."

M. H. M.

CAMBRIDGE, March 20, 1891.

Notes.

READERS of the *Atlantic* have already enjoyed a sample of the autobiography incorporated in the Life of James Freeman Clarke soon to be published by Houghton, Mifflin & Co. In this work the Rev. Samuel May, the Rev. Edward Everett Hale, and Mr. T. W. Higginson have been colaborers. The same firm announces 'Noto: An Unexplored Corner of Japan,' by Percival Lowell; and 'Whist in Diagrams,' by G. W. P.

D. Lothrop Co., Boston, have in press 'Christ Himself,' by the Rev. Alexander McKenzie; and 'Stories of the Land of Evangeline,' by Grace Dean McLeod.

Zola's new novel, 'Money,' is set down for issue this week in an English version by Benjamin R. Tucker, Boston.

G. P. Putnam's Sons have in preparation a translation of the 'Universal History of Literature' by Prof. Gustav Karpeles of the University of Prague, richly illustrated, in six parts, each complete in itself; and a 'Story of the Civil War,' 1860-1865,' by that eminent authority Mr. John Codman Ropes, in two duodecimo volumes, with maps and plans.

The spring list of Dodd, Mead & Co. includes 'Political and Social Letters of a Lady of the Eighteenth Century,' edited by Emily F. D. Osborn; 'Under the Trees and Elsewhere,' by Hamilton Wright Mabie; 'Francis Higginson (1587–1630),' by Thomas Wentworth Higginson, and 'Samuel Houston (1793–1862),' by Henry Bruce, in the "Makers of America" series; Landor's 'Citation of William Shakspere,' and Sainte-Beuve's 'Journal of Maurice de Guérin,' translated by Jessie P. Frothingham, in the "Giunta" series; 'Health without Medicine,' by Theodore H. Mead; and 'Sermons upon Faith, Hope, and Love,' by Prof. J. M. Hoppin of Yale.

Two volumes of short stories are nearly ready to be brought out by Charles Scribner's Sons, viz.: 'Zadoc Pine, and Other Stories,' by H. C. Bunner, and 'Gallegher, and Other Stories,' by Richard Harding Davis. This house will put on the American market Mr. Henry B. Wheatley's 'London, Past and Present,' in three volumes, whose arrangement is alphabetical.

Mr. C. G. Crump has edited for Macmillan Landor's 'Imaginary Conversations' in six volumes, whose appearance will begin in April. The text followed is that of 1876, with close comparison with that of earlier editions.

A 'History of the Press' has been undertaken by Mr. Henry Norman, and will bear the imprint of T. Fisher Unwin. The London *Times* will have a volume to itself, and the *American press will have another among* the several proposed.

The Knickerbocker Nuggets Series of the Messrs. Putnam is decidedly enriched by the two little volumes of 'Representative Irish Tales' compiled with an introduction and notes by W. B. Yeats. Here we have selections, many of them classic, from Miss Edgeworth, the Banims, Carleton, Lover, Maginn, Croker, Griffin, Lever, Kickham, and Miss Mulholland. Mr. Yeats's sententious introduction is a feeling characterization and criticism of the authors he passes in review. Ireland's poems and stories, he says, "came into existence to please nobody but the people of Ireland. Government did not make them on the one hand, nor bad seasons on the other. They are Ireland talking to herself." The Irish gentry "have never had a poet. Poetry needs a God, a cause, or a country." "It seems to be a pretty absolute law that the rich like reading about the poor, the poor about the rich. In Ireland, at any rate, they have liked doing so."

A late issue of "The Great Artists" series (Scribner & Welford) is devoted to 'The Landscape and Pastoral Painters of Holland,' to wit, Ruysdael, Hobbema, Cuyp, and Potter. It may fairly be recommended as giving in a handy form pretty much all the available information about these somewhat uninspiring artists, together with a sufficiently large selection of contradictory criticisms from various sources. The author, Mr. Frank Cundall, expresses few opinions of his own except the tolerably safe one that "a century hence Rousseau, at his best, will possibly be held a greater landscape-painter than Ruysdael; Troyon will be justly placed above Potter, and the pictures of Corot and Daubigny will be more highly thought of than those of Hobbema and Wijnants." If this is not true, it certainly ought to be.

We have received a new edition of the 'Histories' of Tacitus, by the Rev. W. A. Spooner of Oxford (Macmillan & Co.). The text is based upon that of Orelli and Meiser. The commentary is full, and of that excellent sort which makes suggestions to the student instead of loading him with lore or providing him with ready-made translations. Although it owes much to the labors of German scholars, yet it is the first English edition that has any just claim to originality. It is preceded by a long introduction on the state of the Empire and its history during the period of which the text treats. On the whole, we have here a most useful working edition.

Prof. Sonnenschein's critical and explanatory edition of the 'Rudens' of Plautus (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan & Co.) is not only the first English edition of that play, but is the first Plautine work in preparing which the editor has had the advantage of using Studemund's *Apographon* of the Ambrosian MS. The text is conservative, the apparatus full, and the notes, while being thoroughly scholarly, are well fitted to serve as an introduction to the peculiarities of the idiom of Plautus. The volume is beautifully printed, being, in fact, quite the handsomest edition of a Plautine comedy that we have ever seen.

After ten years, Mr. Brander Matthews has brought out a new edition of his 'French Dramatists of the Nineteenth Century' (Charles Scribner's Sons), and has very properly added a chapter reviewing the state and tendencies of the French drama during the decade. The Romanticists have given way to the Naturalists, but whereas "the theatre was almost the first stronghold of the enemy captured by the Romanticists, strive as diligently as it can Naturalism has not yet found its dramatic formula." The dramatizations of Zola's, Daudet's, and Goncourt's novels have, for intrinsic reasons, as Mr. Matthews thinks, been comparative failures. In the period in question no first-rate dramatic talent has come to light, but fumbling and the unrewarded endeavor of a transition state have marked the years 1880-90. The Théâtre Libre is the one invention which seems to have some significance.

We have received a number of historical monographs for which the titles sufficiently speak to all who may be interested in them. The first is Mr. George M. Whipple's 'History of the Salem [Mass.] Light Infantry from 1805 to 1890,' published by the Essex Institute at Salem. In reprinting the original Articles, a facsimile of the title-page is given, and we remark on it a very ornamental rendering of the State arms, which deserves to find a new lease of life in some printing-office. From the author, whose address is No. 147 Benefit Street, Providence, R. I., we have a pamphlet, 'Ancestry of Calvin Guild, Margaret Taft, James Humphreys, and Rebecca Covell Martin, 1620-1890,' by Howard Redwood Guild, who prints but a limited edition. He has attempted to do justice to both the male and female lines, and gives references to his authorities. More than 100 surnames are involved, and there are two charts and an index. The field being Rhode Island, one may infer how many families are affected by these data, comprised within forty pages. Another pamphlet is an 'Account of the Reunion of the Descendants of Rev. Thomas Hooker, First Minister of Hartford, Conn.,' held at Hartford last May (Salem Press Publishing and Printing Co.). To it is appended an address by the Rev. Joseph H. Twichell, delivered in 1889 at the celebration of the 250th anniversary of the adoption of Connecticut's first Constitution—an instrument not at this moment so venerable as it appeared two years ago. Finally, we mention a reprint of the late Dr. Philip Slaughter's 'History of St. George's Parish in the County of Spotsylvania and Diocese of Virginia,' edited, with a biography and continuation, by Mr. R. A. Brock (Richmond: J. W. Randolph & English). This interesting work was published in 1847. A photograph of Dr. Slaughter's handsome and genial face serves as a frontispiece to the new edition.

We welcome the third volume of *Garden and Forest* for the past year (New York: *Garden and Forest* Publishing Co.), which, under Prof. Sargent's enlightened guidance, continues on its high level—its highest level, for it has no peer. It appeals, as mere literature, to every cultivated person, and it is full of information for the lover and grower of flowers and the amateur landscape-gardener. Its pictorial return alone to the subscriber is generous, embracing the novelties and the wonders of the vegetable kingdom.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The *Harvard Law Review* for March prints the prize essay of Mr. Charles E. Shattuck of the Boston bar, on the meaning of the term "liberty" in the clause of the Fourteenth Amendment (and elsewhere) relating to "life, liberty, and property." This is a valuable paper, and may be commended to our lawyers and judges as laying down sound principles for the interpretation of this important phrase. Some have forgotten that it has a history.

A new periodical has been added to those already published at the University of Michigan, called the *Inlander*. In the first number Prof. Henry C. Adams gives a review of the progress of political economy in the United States during the last ten years, showing the increased attention bestowed upon this subject in college courses, and referring to the numerous economic periodicals that have appeared of late years. It seems that the journals published at Harvard and Columbia have both become self-supporting, which is a conclusive proof of the public interest in the topics with which they deal. In the view taken by Mr. Adams, a considerable advance has been made by American economists in the direction of socialism, and he might have added that our legislators are beginning to understand the possibilities opened before them by this new political economy.

We lately had something to say of the new Oxford *Economic Review*. Macmillan & Co. now announce that they shall publish the *Economic Journal*, a quarterly magazine to be issued under the auspices of the British Economic Association, which has a considerable American membership.

Still another new venture in this line is the *Social Economist*, edited by Prof. George Gunton and Starr Hoyt Nichols, and published by the Institute of Social Economics at No. 126 East Twenty-third Street, New York. In the first number, for the current month, President Low of Columbia has a paper on "The University and the Workingman."

The March Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society opens with a paper on the meteorological results of the *Challenger* expedition, by Mr. Alexander Buchan. These show among other things the greater velocity of the wind over the open sea than upon the land, "the mean difference being from four to five miles an hour." This difference is accounted for by the greater friction of the land, while other facts show, further, that "the heating of the surface of the land by the sun is in some way counteractive of friction." At sea, rain fell more frequently at night than during the day, and, of forty-five thunderstorms recorded, twenty-six occurred over the open sea, and all but four at night or in the early morning. Mr. Buchan believes the observations to prove that the surface currents of the ocean are in a very great degree determined by the direction and force of the prevailing winds. The paper is illustrated by four maps of the globe showing the isothermal and isobaric lines for January and July respectively, and two barometric maps of Scandinavia. Mr. G. F. Scott Elliot gives a discouraging report of the soil and vegetation of Madagascar, and Mr. W. B. Harris describes a trip from Fez to Wazan in North Morocco. He passed through one district which was uncultivated because "the place swarms with wild boar and sparrows, one of which uproots the grain, while the second destroy the ripening ear and leave not a particle."

Dr. Carl Peters's account of his expedition for the relief of Emin Pasha, published in the *Scottish Geographical Magazine* for March, is not pleasant reading. He started from the East Coast in July, 1889, with insufficient means to buy food or pay the regular caravan tribute to the natives, and accordingly was obliged to fight his way up the Tana River to the Victoria Nyanza. At one place, for the attempted theft of his mule and the plunder of one of his carriers, he had 600 head of their cattle driven from their pastures into his camp. At another place, on his refusal to pay tribute, the natives took from him "two tons of goods and had also thrown their spears." In retaliation he robbed them of 2,000 head of cattle, and, in the battle which ensued, killed nearly 150 men. It is difficult to see what he accomplished except to leave behind him a hatred for the white man which will long render abortive any efforts to civilize the natives. Mr. J. G. Bartholomew contributes the third of his singularly valuable papers on the "Mapping of the World." In this he gives a list of 700 maps of Asia, by far the greater part having been published within the past ten years. Out of a total area of 17,250,000 square miles, more than 3,000,000 have been topographically surveyed, while only 750,000 remain "unexplored country." This lies mostly in Tibet and Mongolia, though there is a large tract in Arabia and smaller ones in Persia, Siberia, and the East Indies. The accompanying map shows that the Russians have made a topographical survey of the whole route of the projected Siberian railway.

"W." writes to us from Johns Hopkins: "In a recent number of a Southern denominational organ, I saw an English grammar advertised as a Methodist text-book. Is not this an attempt at sectarian learning in line with the proposed denominational university at Washington?"

"B." writes to us from Cleveland: "Your correspondent who writes on the use of the word 'lad' in New England has evidently had little or no dealings with his Irish fellow-citizens. 'Lad' is the ordinary Irish-American term for 'boy' or 'fellow,' and is used generally by the Irish in Connecticut. To me there is no word which more definitely belongs to the Irish-American dialect, or more certainly marks it. The correspondent's boy friends have evidently come to use it by association with Irish boys. The word is Celtic, and the new 'Webster' gives the Irish cognate 'lath,' so its use among the Irish is natural enough. I speak of Connecticut as the part of New England I am most familiar with. I feel quite sure I have heard 'lad' used by the Irish in Boston, in Vermont, in Cleveland, and in fact wherever I have heard them talk."

—Prof. Freeman writes once more in the March *Macmillan's* on the side of the study of Greek. He is a practised controversialist, and puts life into his assault; he will not admit he is on the defensive, but makes a sort of brilliant sally into the ranks of the enemy. Keen in speech and never respectful of persons, he cannot be tedious to those he attacks, and he gives pleasure, which has perhaps a touch of malice in it, to those who would fain see the "ambitious pedagogue" (*i. e.*, head-masters) get his deserts. The grammar schools, Mr. Freeman says, exist for the universities, and not the universities for the grammar schools; and the study of Greek is to be considered from the university point of view—which is as much as to say that it is to be considered with respect to the question what is good for men, not what is good for boys. Greek, he thinks, is essential to culture, and by far the most useful of studies merely educationally and without regard to the place it may hold in after-reading. He writes mainly of the real place of both Greek and Latin in the history of the world—to lose them is to lose a large part of the past; and he asks whether Englishmen really wish to find Greek at Oxford on a plane with Arabic. It is a strong plea: to those who accept Mr. Freeman's axioms it is unanswerable; but, so far as can be judged, Greek is a losing cause, and is not likely to be saved by argument, however sound. The contest is really beyond argument, because it is a battle of different ideals; there is a lack of any common ground and standard to which appeal can be made with any certainty of the opponents understanding each other. And so in this case, too, it will happen that Mr. Freeman's weightiest words will fail of effect because "the ambitious pedagogue" and the *novus homo* of the sciences place no value on those elements of education which he thinks of most consequence, and have a very vague idea of what he is talking about. Such conflicts are not reasoned out, but fought out. It is in vain that literary men come up one by one and give their testimony that Greek is the one thing most needful, so far as their experience tests the matter. They are, after all, a small band, and their influence at the universities is inconsiderable. We find Mr. George Saintsbury, in the next article, contrasting English and French literature in his usual execrable style, but with thought and point enough; and he interrupts his praise of these two literatures as completing each other and making a whole in education, to say that he would not accept French in lieu of Greek and Latin, and again that he would not give up reading Greek and Latin on any consideration. The ranks of literature are very close in favor of the old culture, admitting only the need of more intelligent methods of teaching; but every year the universities yield more and more, and men of letters bred under the old régime have nothing to do with it except to make futile protests. Mr. Saintsbury's article, let us add, is well worth looking up by any one who would read an excellent broad-featured parallel of French and English genius.

—Many people every year, no doubt, read with surprise in their 'Robinson Crusoe' the account of the attack which wolves made upon his party as they were coming down the Pyrenees into France, and wonder a little that those wild beasts had not been exterminated at so late a date as a couple of hundred years ago. Such readers will find cause for still greater astonishment in an article which appeared in the *Revue Rose* of February 7, and which gives a good deal of curious information about the existence of wolves in France at the present day. No less than 315 of these animals were killed in the battues of the year 1889, the Exposition year. In several parts of the country they are a serious nuisance, killing sheep, destroying the little game that still exists, and even attacking human beings. General battues have been held twice a year, in March and in December, for two hundred years and more, under the direction of the lieutenants of *louveterie*. These officers are appointed by the chief of the State upon nomination by the Minister of Forestry, and, apart from their official character, seem to be much like English masters of the hounds. They are taken from the class of wealthy land-owners, keep up at their own cost an *équipage de chasse*, and serve without pay. In return they had, up to 1832, the right to hunt stags, boars, and hares twice a month in the State forests. This privilege is now restricted to the chase of wild boars only. Within the last ten years attempts have been

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

made to exterminate the wolves altogether. In 1882 rewards were offered of 200 francs for every wolf, male or female, known to have attacked a human being; 150 francs for each *louve pleine;* 100 francs for each *louve non pleine*, and 40 francs for each whelp. These rewards were paid in 1889 for 86 animals killed in Dordogne only, and 79 in Charente. In 1888 the numbers were: 100 in Dordogne, 56 in Charente, 53 in Haute-Vienne, 29 in Meuse, and 26 in the Vosges. The north of France, the centre, Normandy, and the basins of Paris and of the Rhone appear to be the only regions that are quite free from them. According to the writer in the *Revue Rose*, the last wolves were killed in Scotland in 1680 and in Ireland in 1710.

—The Year Book of the Holland Society of New York for 1888-'89 comes to us in a sumptuous octavo volume of two hundred and sixty-eight pages, bound in orange and decorated with the two red-white-and-blue flags of the Dutch and American republics. Printed at the De Vinne Press, and furnished with abundant tokens both of the printer's and illustrator's art, as well as of the loving care of the Secretary of the Holland Society, Mr. George W. Van Siclen, who is its editor, it is worthy of a place in the library as well as on the table. The first and major portion of the book is taken up with an account of a trip made by about fifty persons, members of the Society and their friends, to Holland during the summer of 1888. Besides a general description of the tour, there are bound up in the volume the maps, programmes, small guide-books, and catalogues of exhibitions specially prepared for their American guests by their hosts in Holland. The American pilgrims, returning to visit the homes of their ancestors, were everywhere received with unusual demonstrations of welcome. At Leyden the librarians and curators of that well-preserved city prepared an exhibition of documents, books, pictures, and relics from public and private collections relating to the Pilgrim Fathers and to the Dutch settlements in North America. These Dutch scholars of Leyden, though unable, despite their wide reading, to understand why the credit of settling America and of founding the nation is given chiefly to the Scrooby Separatists, nevertheless did their best to illustrate this part of the connection between Dutch and American history. There is an interesting paper on Jesse de Forest, the founder of New Amsterdam, which will interest New Yorkers. The papers of the historian, Rev. J. H. Suydam, especially that one relating to the finding of a portrait of Washington, are also of more than passing interest. In the latter portion of the book are given the speeches and proceedings of the dinner of the Holland Society in New York on January 8, 1889, and in Albany February 14 of the same year. Enriched with portraits and other illustrative matter, in addition to the winnowed text, the volume serves as a pleasing remembrancer of the ties between our country and the republic of northern Europe in which not only the Pilgrim Fathers, but nearly all the English Puritan leaders who settled in New England before 1640 A. D., received their political education. It serves, also, to refresh the memory of those who forget the great debt which the American owes to the Dutch republic, which, both to the colonists of the seventeenth century, the revolutionists of the eighteenth, and to the makers of the Constitution in 1787, was a living reality. The spirit of Bradford's words to the New Netherlands authorities in 1627 —"acknowledging ourselves tied in a strict obligation unto your country and State, for the good entertainment and free liberty which we had, and our brethren and countrymen yet there have and do enjoy, under your most honourable Lords and States"—was continued in Benjamin Franklin when, to the first Congress under the Constitution, he declared that "in the love of liberty, and bravery in the defence of it, she [Holland] has been our great example." We may add, by the way, that, after the adjournment of the International Congregational Council in London, July 12-21, the coming summer, a large number of Americans will proceed to Leyden to witness the unveiling of a tablet to the memory of John Robinson and his congregation.

—We have received a proof of the latest in the remarkable series of portraits on wood by G. Kruell from time to time commended in these columns—Abraham Lincoln. It is issued by F. Keppel, 20 East Sixteenth Street, who will also fill orders for the limited editions of the Darwins, Garrison, Phillips, Asa Gray, and Godkin, by the same engraver. The block is somewhat larger than its predecessors, measuring 8.5x10.5 inches, and reaches a limit of size which it can hardly be worth while to exceed for portraiture. This extraordinary print of Lincoln is, we do not hesitate to say, destined to be the historic likeness of the first President of our free republic. It is based upon the same photograph which Rajon etched in an unsatisfactory way a little before his death, and which St. Gaudens used in modelling the bust of the sculptured Lincoln—that at Chicago. But Mr. Kruell has also wrought into it the contemporary life-mask, and has invested the whole with that interpretation of character which distinguishes his portraits from those of any other artist. It is easy to say of the result that it will efface any portrait of Lincoln in black and white, hitherto produced, that may be placed beside it; but it is hard to describe in words the refinement and breadth of treatment, sureness of aim, harmony of modelling and of chiaroscuro, realism in the essential traits of physiognomy and legendary ideality of expression and sentiment, which nothing has yet approached. The quality of the portrait as a whole is not only masterly, but old-masterly; and as for the technique, it is a surprising advance even on the incomparable series enumerated above. It is a definitive challenge, by the head of the new school of American wood-engraving, to all other modes and schools of engraving to show cause why, in the estimation of connoisseurs and in commercial value, the most popular medium of pictorial art should not also be the most precious and the most sought after in its highest achievements.

VON SYBEL'S FOUNDING OF THE GERMAN EMPIRE.

The Founding of the German Empire by William I. By Heinrich von Sybel. Translated by M. L. Perrin, Ph.D. (Gött.), of Boston University, assisted by Gamaliel Bradford, jr. Vols. I., II. Thomas Y. Crowell & Co. 1891.

No more important historical work has appeared in the last decade than Von Sybel's 'Begründung des deutschen Reichs.' The movement which he describes ranks with the consolidation of the American Union and the establishment of Italian unity as one of the three greatest political achievements of our time; and his book is the first history of the German unity movement that is based throughout upon original material. The author received from Prince Bismarck, in 1881, permission to use the Prussian state papers for the purpose of writing this history, and since Droysen's death he has been the custodian of the Prussian archives. The Prussian collection includes the archives of Hanover, Electoral Hesse, and Nassau, seized in 1866, and these have enabled the historian to follow the movements of anti-Prussian diplomacy down to that date.

It is, of course, the Prussian side of the story that is here presented, and the narrative will eventually be supplemented, and perhaps in some degree corrected, by histories based upon the archives of Austria, France, and other European States. But the Prussian side will always be the most important, and it is not likely that Von Sybel's work will need to be done over again. When it was known that he was engaged upon this great task, there was but one feeling in Germany—that of satisfaction. Von Sybel won a cosmopolitan reputation in 1853, with the first volume of his 'Revolutionszeit,' and since the death of Ranke, as Kluckhohn said recently in the *Rundschau*, he has "incontestably occupied the place of honor" among German historians. The five volumes which have appeared, and which carry the narrative down to the close of the year 1866, have not disappointed expectation. From both the scientific and the literary point of view they rank among the best products of German historical genius.

The historian has striven to be just to Prussia's antagonists. "Nowhere in the book," he says in his preface, "have I attempted to deny my Prussian and National-Liberal convictions. I hope, however, for recognition of my endeavor to confess, without palliation, the faults committed and the mistakes made in our own camp; to judge justly and fairly the conduct of our adversaries; in other words, not to derive the motives of their action from folly or wickedness, but to comprehend them as the result of the historic premises of their entire position." (The translation is ours.) The practice of the author accords with this declaration of purpose. Frederick William IV. is not defended; Schwarzenberg, Rechberg, Napoleon III. are not assailed; the effort of the author is to discover the springs of their action, to comprehend them himself, and to explain them to the reader.

The period to be covered by the entire history is from 1848 to 1870 inclusive. The two volumes of the American translation which form the subject of the present notice, extend to 1863.

The author rightly judges that the triumphs of 1866 and 1870 cannot be understood without examining the failures of 1849 and 1850. To these again an historic introduction is necessary. Nearly a third of the first volume (book i.) is accordingly devoted to a sketch of the political development of Germany from the earliest times down to 1848. These chapters are written in the manner which Ranke has used so often and so effectively. The more remote history is given in the broadest outlines; the less remote with more detail; until, as the author approaches the period which he has undertaken to describe, the narrative becomes so full and complete that the reader passes almost insensibly from the preface to the body of the history. The keynote of the preface—and of the whole history, in fact—is struck at the end of the second chapter, where it is pointed out that the political situation of Germany, at the close of the eighteenth century, was dominated by the "dualism" between Austria and Prussia, while the political psychology of the German people exhibited a singular mixture of cosmo-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

politan ideas and narrow State-rights sentiments. The next four chapters describe the Napoleonic supremacy and the War of Liberation; the unsatisfactory organization of the German Confederation in 1815; the attempt of Metternich to strengthen the Federal Diet in order more effectively to crush out revolutionary tendencies—an attempt which for the moment made the Liberals themselves State-rights men; the development of the Prussian Customs Union, which gave all Germany, outside of Austria, an economic unity; the rapid growth, in the forties, of a national sentiment; and, finally, a keen and striking analysis of the character and ideas of Frederick William IV. —next to Frederick the Great the most brilliant and, without exception, the most ineffective of Prussian Kings; a man who had every talent except the political, and was in sympathy with every age save that in which he lived.

Books ii. and iii. describe the attempt of the Liberals, whom the Revolution of 1848 had made, for the moment, masters of Germany, to establish a permanent national organization. The National Assembly was forced at length, by the logic of the situation, to vote the exclusion of Austria, and the consolidation of the "narrower Germany" into a democratic empire with a Prussian emperor; a result which a compact minority, headed by Von Gagern, had contemplated from the outset. Frederick William IV. refused the imperial crown, and the popular movement came to a speedy end. No previous writer has shown so clearly the cross-play, in the Frankfort Assembly, of national and particularistic sentiments, of conservative, liberal, and democratic ideas, of visionary enthusiasm and practical politics; but what is really new in this history is the exact statement of Frederick William's attitude towards the unity movement and of the considerations (or emotions) which determined his negative decision. It is in the midst of this period that we gain the first glimpse of the young Bismarck, encouraging the King (with a frankness of speech which shocked the Queen) to pluck up heart and resist the Revolution (vol i., page 286, translation). We learn also, for the first time, we think, that Bismarck was instrumental in securing the appointment of Count Brandenburg as Premier of a Conservative Ministry.

The contents of books iv. and v., in which the action centres at Berlin, may be said to be wholly new. These books describe the attempt of Prussia to establish the "narrower union" in concert with the princes of Germany; the collapse of this policy; the submission of Prussia to Austria at Olmütz, and the reëstablishment of the old Confederation. We have had, until now, only the external frame of these events; Von Sybel gives us the inside view. We follow every move in the diplomatic game; we sit in council with the Prussian King and his ministers; for the first time we understand Olmütz. One episode of this period was treated by Von Sybel some three years ago in an article entitled "Graf Brandenburg in Warschau," published in the *Historische Zeitschrift;* but all the rest of the story is new.

Book vi. covers the years from 1851 to 1857—years of comparative quiet in Germany, although Europe was agitated by the reëstablishment of the Napoleonic empire and the reopening of the Oriental question. Bismarck now begins to assume prominence in the narrative. His courage had impressed the irresolute Frederick William, his devotion to the royal prerogative had won the King's confidence; and when the Confederate Diet was reestablished at Frankfort, Bismarck soon became the Prussian representative in that body. During the Crimean War, all the chief threads of European intrigue ran through Frankfort, and Bismarck began to exercise a marked influence upon Prussia's general policy. His Frankfort despatches are therefore most valuable material for this period; but these despatches we have had for several years. They were published in 1882-84, with admirable introductions, which, we now learn, were written by Von Sybel himself.

Book vii. deals mainly with the period of the regency of Prince William, 1858–60 inclusive, and closes with his coronation in 1861. As Regent, William deemed it improper to break completely with his brother's policy, but his stronger character made itself felt at once, and Prussia's action became more decided and more consistent. The first steps were taken towards the reorganization of the army, in the face of growing opposition on the part of the Diet. As King, William pursued his aims with increased energy. The semi-Liberal Hohenzollern ministry, unwilling to face the conflict, resigned. In book viii. the historian describes the first year of Bismarck's premiership, 1862–63. The policy of "blood and iron" was announced, the "open place" in the Constitution was discovered, and the reserve powers of the Crown were brought into action. In the Polish insurrection, Bismarck sided resolutely with Russia against Austria and the western Powers. To Sir Andrew Buchanan, the English ambassador, Bismarck announced that, if the Russians were expelled from Poland, Prussia would herself occupy the kingdom. "Europe will never suffer that," said Sir Andrew. "Who is Europe?" inquired Bismarck. His attitude was dictated by the clear interests of Prussia. Russia had been on bad terms with Austria since the Crimean war, and the tension between these Powers was increased by Austria's hostile attitude in 1863. Prussia's support was doubly valuable at a time when Russia stood alone; it won Russia's gratitude and friendship, and the Russian support was of immense value in Bismarck's subsequent ventures.

The whole Polish question is more fully treated than Von Sybel's main object requires, but Poland has always been a favorite subject with this historian. Every student will remember his discussion and defence of the partition of Poland in his 'Revolutionszeit.' Now as then he is no friend of Poland, and his treatment of the insurrection of 1863 is extremely unsympathetic.

The second volume closes with Austria's theatrical attempt to solve the German question in the Austrian interest by a Congress of princes. Against his own judgment and inclination, King William held aloof from the Congress. The result vindicated Bismarck's foresight: the Austrian attempt came to nothing. In this same year, 1863, the Schleswig-Holstein question arose again, and Bismarck found his opportunity to solve the German problem. The Schleswig-Holstein question, the Danish war, the conflict between Austria and Prussia, and the formation of the North-German Confederation—these matters form the subject of Von Sybel's third, fourth, and fifth volumes, which we shall notice later, when the translation of these volumes is completed.

The translation of the first two volumes is anything but satisfactory. It is fluent, indeed, but not always idiomatic, and it is full of errors. Many of these are obviously due to carelessness. On page 8 of vol. i. we read that the German colonists of the Slavic East were "invited and favored by the rulers, who were themselves foreigners." Von Sybel says, "invited and favored by the foreign rulers themselves." In chap. iii. the author says that the first Napoleon became "the over-lord of *half* Europe." The translators make him say, "the master of *all* Europe" (p. 28). A little further along, the author tells us that the first North-German conspiracies against Napoleon had no "central point of guidance," but that the Prussian Government soon furnished such a central point. The translators say that there was no "central idea" in the movement until Prussia assumed its guidance (pp. 31, 32). A "central idea" of course existed all along—the liberation of the Fatherland. In addition to positive errors of this sort, there is a constant effacement in the translation of precise shades of meaning. This is the more unfortunate because Von Sybel is one of the most exact of historical writers. Every word of his is carefully weighed; nothing more is conveyed than the facts warrant; an important qualification is often contained in a seemingly unimportant adjective. Much of this is lost in the translation—and quite needlessly, for in most cases a literal rendering would preserve the sense without violence to English idioms.

There are many other errors, and graver errors, which are obviously due, not to the translators' carelessness, but to their ignorance of German history and German public law. On page 17 they tell us that, "by the quarrels of the Emperor Joseph II. and his mother during their co-regency, the dignity and unity of the imperial power were lost." Every student of Germany history knows that Maria Theresa was never co-regent of the Empire. Her husband was Emperor, and so was her son Joseph II.; by virtue of her husband's dignity, she bore the title of Empress; but in her own right she was only Queen of Bohemia and Hungary, Archduchess of Austria, etc. Referring to the German, we find that it was "die Centralregierung" of Austria, not the imperial power, that lost poise and unity through the co-regency.

Technical terms of politics and law regularly bring the translators to grief. On page 10 of volume i. we are told that, in the reign of Maximilian, "a number of imperial institutions . . . were brought into existence in the States." The German text makes the opposite statement, viz., that a number of "ständische Einrichtungen," *i. e.*, institutions created and controlled by the Estates, were brought into existence in the Empire. Among these was a "ständisches Reichsregiment," *i. e.*, a system of imperial administration conducted by the Estates; the translators make a wild shot at the word "regiment," and render the phrase "a State contingent of the Imperial Army." On pages 35, 64, and elsewhere, when mention is made of the plan of convoking "Reichsstände," or Estates-General, in Prussia, and of publishing a "Reichsverfassung," or general Constitution, for Prussia ("Reich" indicating simply the whole kingdom as against the separate provinces), the translators speak of an "imperial" legislature and an "imperial" constitution. The result is to confuse, in the reader's mind, the Prussian and the German movements; for the German patriots did desire an imperial constitution and an imperial Parliament. This objection seems, after a time, to have occurred to the translators, for on page 71 "Reichsstände" is translated by the single word "Estates"—which obliterates the very important distinction between the local or provincial estates then in existence and the proposed general estates—and on pages 73, 74, and 75 the same word is rendered "royal estates," which is meaningless. In still other parts of the volume the troublesome word

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Stände" is rendered by "constituencies," which confounds the representatives with their electors. And on page 46, "ständische Verfassung" and "ständische Rechte" are translated "provincial constitution" and "provincial rights," although the constitution and the rights in question were those of entire States and their inhabitants.

Almost any sort of a political division, from the early German "Gau" down to the "Landschaft" (and even, as in the case just cited, a State itself) is a "province." "Rechtspflege," the administration of justice, becomes "jurisprudence" (vol. i, p. 6). "Strafbare Rechtswidrigkeit," which means any punishable violation of law, is translated "State crime" (p. 15). "Rechtssicherheit" signifies security of civil rights: it is translated "constitutional rights" (p. 30). "Staatsrechtliche Streitigkeiten," constitutional controversies within a State, is rendered "differences between the States" (p. 46). "Schutz gegen Justizverweigerung," protection (by appeal) against denial of justice, is turned into the "right of public trial" (ibid). "Tax reform" is narrowed into "tariff reform"; "Anleihe," a loan, is translated (or misprinted) "law" (p. 71), and "Binnenzölle," or internal customs duties levied upon goods passing from one part of a State to another part, are twisted into "internal excise duties" (p. 74).

Perhaps the most extraordinary, certainly the most bewildering, freak of this translation is the rendition of "Particularismus," "Sonderthum," and similar expressions. In one passage (page 27) "partikulare Gesinnung" is translated "personal ideas"—which does not mislead the reader because it means nothing—but the word usually employed is "individualism." If "particularism," a word which is fairly acclimated already, is not good enough English for the translators, why do they not say "State sovereignty" or "State rights"? These are the American equivalents of particularism. Particularism and individualism are so far from being the same thing that particularism is frequently the bitterest enemy of individualism. So it was in the Augsburg peace of 1555, when each secular prince of the German Empire obtained the right of imposing his creed upon all the inhabitants of his territory. Nothing was then left to individualism in religion but the right of emigration. But this peace of Augsburg (which Von Sybel declares to have brought profit only to the "partikulare Gewalten") the translators calmly proclaim to have been "exclusively favorable to individualism" (page 12). This is like saying that the eleventh amendment to the United States Constitution, which makes it impossible for an individual to sue a State, is a triumph of "individualism."

It will not escape the careful reader that all our instances of mistranslation are taken from the first eighty pages of the first volume. What harvest might be reaped from the following thousand pages we do not undertake to say. A hasty examination of the last chapter of the second volume, however, has convinced us that the translators have learned something in the progress of their work. The errors are not so gross nor the infelicities so numerous. But in some cases they avoid error by refusing to translate technical terms at all, simply omitting them, which does not conduce to clearness.

Von Sybel's German publisher has protested that this translation is unauthorized. He characterizes the act of the American translators and the American publisher as "another illustration of the views prevailing in the United States concerning the literary property of foreign nations." It is conceivably in the power of the American publisher to remove the grievance of his German colleague; an injury to the pocket can be made good. But how are the gentlemen who have laid unlicensed hands upon the work of a foreign scholar, and who have defaced it, to make good the wrong that they have done to his reputation?

POLLOCK'S INTRODUCTION TO THE SCIENCE OF POLITICS.

An Introduction to the History of the Science of Politics. By Sir Frederick Pollock, Bart., Corpus Christi Professor of Jurisprudence in the University of Oxford. Macmillan & Co.

WITHIN the compass of one hundred and twenty-six pages, Sir F. Pollock has undertaken to sketch the history of one of the largest topics with which philosophers or historians have ever had to deal, and regarding the very nature and meaning of which many controversies have raged. It is no small praise to say that in writing so briefly on so vast a theme he has been neither commonplace nor superficial, but has given his readers matter well digested and of solid worth, touching often lightly, sometimes slightly, but never weakly, on the more salient aspects and problems that belong to what is called political science. After discussing the question whether the study of the State and its powers and functions deserves to be reckoned a science at all, he plunges into the history of the subject by an account of the views of Aristotle, whom he regards as the father of all subsequent political thinkers; laying, as we think, too little stress on the services of Plato, whose speculations, however far removed from the facts of human society, have at more than one epoch exercised a profoundly stimulating and moulding influence upon the minds of men. So far, however, as politics is a science, Aristotle is no doubt the thinker who did most to give it scientific form; and in some respects his views were more just and conformable to history as we now know it than those of any of his successors down to our own days. From Aristotle Pollock leaps almost at once to Macchiavelli, giving a few passing words to Dante, and then presents us with a careful and exact, though of course very condensed, account of the speculations of Bodin, Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau regarding the origin of civil society and the nature of political authority. To this account he adds remarks upon Montesquieu and Burke, who by their methods and tendencies belong rather to the historical than to the *a-priori* school. The last part deals with Bentham and Austin, as representing the English analytic school who approach political science from the point of view of utilitarian ethics, reviving the doctrines of Hobbes regarding the nature of the State; and with the German writers on the so-called Law of Nature who develop juristic and political notions out of ethical and metaphysical conceptions.

This brief outline shows how much has been omitted. There is hardly anything about mediæval doctrines, though these have considerable importance in the history of the subject; hardly anything about the relations of political philosophy to the political conditions of the civilized world during the last twenty-two centuries; nothing regarding the discussions which have filled so many minds and books regarding the merits of various forms of government and their administrative machinery, the rights of the citizen, the relations of the State to the Church and of States to one another. For these omissions our author is not to be blamed. He has wisely chosen rather to do some things thoroughly than many things in a sketchy and inadequate way. Many parts of the book, as, for instance, his remarks on Montesquieu and Burke, his reflections on the contrast between the English and the Continental points of view of jurisprudence and its relation to politics and ethics, are quite admirable in their terseness, their clearness, their unprejudiced good sense. No living writer in England or America, or, for the matter of that, in Germany or France, could have put his points better. Compare him, for instance, with Mr. Herbert Spencer, whom he sometimes quotes. Mr. Spencer's contributions to political and historical science seem to us mere commonplaces, sometimes false, sometimes true, but in both cases trying to disguise their essential flatness and commonness in a garb of dogmatic formalism. So John Austin, who is frequently referred to by Sir F. Pollock (though usually to be refuted) is one of the most barren and least penetrating authors whom the praises of friends ever pushed up into some sort of reputation. But Sir F. Pollock, with far less formal pomp than Mr. Spencer, far less dogmatic self-assertion than John Austin, has more to say that is worth hearing and pondering over than either of these writers.

The parts of the book which have chiefly interested us are the statement and criticism of the progress of doctrines from Bodin to Rousseau regarding the origin of civil society, and the view of the form which the fundamental problems of jurisprudence have assumed in our own time. It is not easy for us moderns who have been thoroughly imbued with the methods and temper of history to understand why Bodin and Hobbes should have labored so hard to find a foundation for the authority of the State. To us the problem is in one sense perfectly simple, in another perfectly insoluble. It is simple in so far as we understand how, in point of fact, civil society has been formed. We have had opportunities of observing communities in all degrees of civilization. We perceive that everywhere, even among Fuegians and Australian savages, there exists some kind of organization, however rudimentary, and that organization implies authority, and that authority tends, as communities advance for a certain time, to become more stringent and more concentrated until some sort of State with a recognized government is constituted, the powers of such authority becoming more and more defined, first by custom and ultimately by law. We see no occasion for any such theory as that of the original compact, or *contrat social*, to explain the phenomena of the growth of States out of families and tribes, even if we could suppose that the formation of such covenants was the sort of thing primitive man was likely to do. As regards the nature and ground of the authority of the State over the individual, we should now say, in the first place, that something of the kind is to be expected, because, as Aristotle observed long ago, ἄνθρωπος φύσει πολιτικὸν ξῶον—man is by his own nature a being fitted for civil life. Every man is born into communities which he finds already subsisting, and he can neither ignore them nor be ignored by them. That their rules should bind him is a necessity of the case, which he can escape only by betaking himself to a desert island. All this seems now obvious. If the inquirer, however, is not satisfied with historical explanations, and insists on having some ground of abstract reason given why men should be required to obey other men, apart from the fact that the world has practically

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proceeded on the hypothesis that they must so obey, it is not easy to find any such ground, for an appeal to physical force rather cuts than unties the knot. And if he goes on to ask what are the tests by which a just government may be distinguished from an unjust one, so that the citizen shall know when he ought to obey and when he may properly rebel, we shall answer that there exists no such general test, and that it depends on the circumstances of each particular case whether insurrection is a crime, or a right, or a duty. These, however, were the questions on which some of the most powerful intellects of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries were occupied, and which more than once passed from the study of the philosopher to become the theme of hot debate in assemblies, or the motive force of political parties.

Two reasons may, we think, be assigned for the importance attached to them. One is the fact that when the power of the Roman Church and of what may be called the religious theory of civil government—that which represented Pope, Emperor, and King as divinely commissioned authorities—fell and vanished, men felt the necessity of putting some other formal and imposing theory in its place, and were not content with the simple explanation or denial of any mystery in the matter which now satisfies us. The other is, that the difference between legal authority and moral authority, between that which the ruler has a legal title to do and that which he ought to or may in conscience do, had not been fully apprehended, and men sought for a doctrine which would explain and bring into accord phenomena which we regard as lying, so to speak, in different planes. Some such confusion seems to lurk in the systems both of Hobbes and of Rousseau. Locke and the English statesmen of the Revolution were on ground somewhat more stable and real; for though the commonwealth of England was not built upon any original compact of its members with one another, there might be said to be a sort of contract between the Crown and its subjects, the obedience of the latter being conditional on the observance by the former of his coronation oath and of the engagements entered into by his predecessors from the great charter downwards. It is to be hoped that this question of the nature of sovereignty, which has haunted politics like a gibbering and unsubstantial ghost for centuries, and still lingers in the belated treatises of Austin and the other followers of Bentham, has now at length been laid to rest and will trouble us no more.

The other topic which has specially interested us, as handled by Sir F. Pollock, is the modern German school of writers on what is called *Naturrecht*, including such men as Röder, Trendelenburg, Ahrens. He says just the right thing about it, viz.: that it is not so empty and vague as English lawyers, and even perhaps most English jurists, commonly assume, but that it has not a practical value for the purposes of legal study quite commensurate to its high pretensions and to the fulness with which German professors treat it. Its province is the borderland between ethics on the one hand and law or political science on the other. It examines the conceptions and relations which belong to this borderland with much acuteness, and in so far lays a foundation for legal study which is not to be despised. It is at least as much to the purpose as the lucubrations on the principle of utility to be found in Bentham or Austin, and has the advantage of presenting a somewhat wider view of the scope and organs of law than that of those who seem unable to imagine any form of legal rule other than an English Act of Parliament. But, it must be admitted, the method of these books on Natural Law is so very abstract, and the labor of reading them so disproportionate to the crop of ideas which one can raise from them, that few Englishmen or Americans are likely to spend, or can be advised to spend, time upon them. Sir F. Pollock, indeed, thinks that "the bent of American publicists is towards the Continental habit of thought. They believe in the Common Law, like English judges of the seventeenth century, and in the Law of Nature, like German philosophers." It is true that some eminent professors in our law schools refuse to teach the law of their own State merely, preferring to handle the law as common to the United States generally. But we do not believe that there is more tendency in this country than in England to the German way of regarding jurisprudence in general. It is almost the only point—and certainly not a grave one—in which we differ from our author, whose book is one of quite exceptional merit.

The Adventures of Thomas Pellow of Penryn. [Adventure Series.] London: T. Fisher Unwin; New York: Macmillan & Co.

THIS curious book was first published in 1740, two years after the author's return from his twenty-three years' captivity among the Moors. Dr. Robert Brown has written an interesting introduction and a number of notes elucidating the text, but otherwise the book is a reprint of the original edition, except that some passages stolen from other authors have been omitted. Until recently the value of Pellow's narrative as a contribution to the very slender stock of knowledge of Morocco has been overlooked, but investigation has confirmed its general accuracy both as regards topographical and historical statements. The country is little known to-day, and was less known in the last century, and it is therefore not surprising that some of the wonderful things here recorded should have led his readers to doubt Pellow's truthfulness.

The most plausible account of the origin of the Barbary pirates is that when the Moors were driven out of Spain, they took their revenge by preying on the commerce of the Christians; but there is good authority for the theory that they received their earliest lessons in seamanship from the privateers who had won both glory and profit in Queen Elizabeth's time, and found themselves out of work in the following reign. Certain it is that Capt. John Smith of Virginian fame was for a time in the service of the Sultan of Morocco, and that many of the Moorish leaders, both on land and sea, were European outcasts. In Pellow's time the Governor of Sallee was a Frenchman named Pillet, and as late as 1780 a Scotchman known as "Omar" commanded a piratical craft, and it is safe to assume that both these gentlemen had "left their country for their country's good." The Europeans who were captured in merchantmen and refused to adopt the Moorish religion and dress, were cruelly treated and kept at hard labor on buildings and other public works. The Emperor Muley Ismaïl, who reigned from 1672 to 1727, when remonstrated with for cruelty towards Christian captives, replied that he was like a man with a bag of rats, and must keep them stirring, or they would eat their way through! On the other hand, those who "turned Moor," as Pellow and others did, found pleasanter employment, and were sometimes raised to important commands in the army. Muley Ismaïl's executioner, who was remarkably skilful in cutting off heads with one blow of the sword, was an Exeter man, and owed his success in life to his early training as a butcher. Many of these apostates were presented with wives by the Emperor, and their fair-haired descendants are pointed out to the traveller in Fez and Mequinez to this day.

It was in 1715, when he was eleven years old, that Thomas Pellow, "being at the Latin School in Penryn, and by no means liking my so early rising, and (as I then thought) most severe discipline of the school," persuaded his uncle to take him along with him on the good ship *Francis* bound for Genoa. The *Francis* was captured off Cape Finisterre by two Sallee rovers, and the crew, together with captives from other vessels, were marched from Sallee to Mequinez, and there put to work and subjected to much cruel treatment. The Emperor, however, seems to have taken a fancy to Pellow, who was persuaded to "turn Moor," and, having done so, was better treated and set to learn Arabic. At the time of Commodore Stewart's embassy for the redemption of British captives in 1721 he seems to have acted as interpreter, and he says that he could tell many things of moment about this embassy; "but as I am informed there is a book of it already printed, I shall not go about in anywise to interfere with it." This scrupulous non-interference is no longer characteristic of African travellers. Again, in 1727, Capt. Russel went on a similar embassy, and mentions having met Pellow, "a young fellow of good family in Cornwall, but now turned Moor." These embassies resulted in the liberation of some of the English captives, but the cases of Pellow and the other renegades were not deemed worthy of their consideration.

As time went on, Pellow showed courage in the field and some military talent, and was appointed to the command of a considerable body of horse. The Emperor gave him a wife with whom he seems to have lived happily in the brief intervals between different campaigns; but the ardor of his affection was kept well in hand, for when, at a later period, he was informed of the sudden death of his wife and a little daughter, he says: "I thought them to have been far better off than they could have been in this troublesome world, and therefore it gave me very little uneasiness"! In the course of his endless marches about the country, he was often wounded, and still oftener in danger from lions and other wild beasts. He says that if a man meets a lion, he should stare him full in the face and loudly abuse him in the language of the country ("for fear he may not understand English"), and that if he is so treated, he will generally decamp. It is a singular proof of Pellow's truthfulness that these tactics are exactly those employed by the Moors of to-day, though lions are no longer as numerous as they used to be.

In spite of his military success, Pellow became weary of the continual civil war that followed the death of Muley Ismaïl. That venerable ruffian is said by one authority to have left 900 sons; and even if we prefer another historian who reduces the number to 520, there would still remain a substantial basis for these wars of succession. During all this period Pellow's thoughts were constantly bent on efforts to escape. Twice he was unsuccessful and came near losing his life in consequence. On one of these occasions he and a comrade, by deliberate perjury, turned the tables on a third Englishman, who at first shared and afterwards betrayed their plot; and he naïvely describes his embarrassment on meeting this unhappy Englishman's sister after his return to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

England, but decides that he was justified by the facts. The story of his third and last attempt is crowded with the most thrilling and dramatic incidents. As one misfortune after another befalls him, it seems impossible that he should succeed; but pertinacity and nerve carry him through the slough of despond, and finally, in the year of grace 1738, "the so long lost sheep is again restored to his owners after his long straying and grievous hardships amongst those monsters and ravenous wolves of infidelity." With such pious phrases does the good man eke out his somewhat lean store of moral rectitude.

A. M. Mackay, Pioneer Missionary of the Church Missionary Society to Uganda. By his sister. With portrait and map. [Author's Edition.] A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1890. 8vo, pp. viii., 488.

"THE best missionary since Livingstone," is Mr. Stanley's estimate of the subject of this biography. This testimony, which all who knew Mackay and his work will heartily endorse, is significant as showing the qualities and training which insure the greatest success in savage Africa. He was in many respects a singularly interesting character. A skilful civil engineer, with a university education, but thoroughly imbued with the straitest Scotch theology, he burned with a zeal to convert the heathen, and at the same time held the steam-engine only second to the Bible as a civilizing agent. Road-making, boat-building, work at his forge, were for him inseparable adjuncts to the preaching of the Gospel. There was, from his point of view, no opposition in religion and science, but the one was essential to the other in Christianizing the black man. One secret of his success, it should be added, was the rare faculty that he had of attaching the natives to him. This is the more noteworthy, as he confesses to having had "an almost uncontrollable aversion" to black people. Not only did he fully overcome this, but one of his associates says of him that his love for his black converts was very touching. Perhaps none but Livingstone and Stanley have ever gained so great an influence over the African. "For many days before we reached his mission," says Mr. Jephson, "we heard from the natives of Mackay, nothing but Mackay—they seemed to care for and know of no one else." Gen. Gordon early recognized his peculiar ability and traits, and offered him a high position in his service, which the young man, intent only on missionary work, declined.

The story of his short life is quickly told. He was born in 1849 in a Scotch parsonage, studied at Edinburgh, and, after leaving the University, was employed for three years in Germany as a draughtsman of machinery. During a part of this time he spent his evenings in translating Lübsen's 'Differential and Integral Calculus,' and in "inventing an agricultural machine which obtained the first prize at the exhibition of steam machines held at Breslau." In 1874 he offered himself for missionary work in Madagascar, with the hope of establishing a college "to train the young men in religion and science together," and the expectation of executing public works, such as railways, mines, etc. The time, however, was not ripe for ambitious enterprises like these, and his offer was declined.

Notwithstanding this check, his purpose remained unchanged, and in 1876 he was accepted for service in the Uganda mission, being one of the eight pioneers sent out in response to King Mtesa's invitation given through Mr. Stanley. From various causes he was prevented from reaching this country for more than two years after landing at Zanzibar, the interval being mainly employed in building a road and forwarding caravans and supplies from the coast to the Victoria Nyanza. His work in Uganda extended over eight troubled years, his chief antagonists being the Arabs and the witch-doctors. Driven out by Mwanga during his frightful persecution of the Christians in 1887, he retired to the southern end of the lake, where he built a new station. Here for two years more he kept at his task of giving a Christian civilization to the negro, steadfastly refusing to heed the earnest entreaties from friends and employers to return home and recruit his exhausted strength. The end came suddenly through an attack of fever on February 8, 1890.

Mr. Stanley's description of the station, as seen by him a few months before Mackay's death, gives a good idea of the industrial side of his work. "There was a big, solid workshop in the yard, filled with machinery and tools, a launch's boiler was being prepared by the blacksmiths, a big canoe was outside repairing; there were saw-pits and large logs of hard timber," and many quiet laborers. In addition to occupations such as these, he was an indefatigable teacher, and not only reduced the vernacular of Uganda to writing, but also translated and printed portions of the Bible in this language from types of his own make.

It is difficult from his sister's account to get a true impression of what Mr. Mackay was and what he accomplished. She has evidently been hampered in two ways, by her desire to write a biography of the old-fashioned kind which should be edifying, and by her belief that the history of the Uganda Mission is generally known. Accordingly, a large part of the book is given up to long and, we are bound to say, often tedious extracts from her brother's diaries and letters, while important events are only briefly referred to or altogether omitted. References to the natives and their customs and to the country and its varied life are far too few for the interest of the biography. We regret this especially because Mr. Mackay's career contained more that would stimulate young men to self-sacrificing lives than that of any missionary of our day. He was the true type of man that Africa most needs.

Socialism, New and Old. By William Graham, M.A., Professor of Political Economy and Jurisprudence, Queen's College, Belfast. [International Scientific Series.] D. Appleton & Co. 1891.

THE plan of this book is praiseworthy. Prof. Graham first considers socialism historically, with a view to showing that in its essence it is no new thing, that it is always produced by like causes, and that in the form of communism it is obsolete. After a summary view of the earlier socialism, he examines at length the great modern systems, represented by Rousseau, St.-Simon, and Marx, pointing out in detail the strong as well as the weak features of each. His array of objections is formidable and apparently conclusive, but sincere Socialists, we apprehend, will not be crushed by them. Their strength is elsewhere than in their logic, and Prof. Graham might well recall the exclamation of Burke: "I am most afraid of the weakest reasonings, because they discover the strongest passions."

After having demolished the main positions of modern socialism, Prof. Graham tries his hand at a little constructive work in the socialistic line. He decides, without thinking it worth while to offer proof, that capitalists get larger profits than is fair, and laborers lower wages than is just. This is half the battle, and it is no more difficult to assume the remainder of his case, viz., that his expedients would result in more equitable division of material wealth than at present takes place. Co-operative production has failed hitherto; it has failed when aided by the State; but still we cannot be sure that it may not succeed better in the future than the past, and we ought to experiment further with State aid. Then all the professions, the best places in the public service and in business, are now monopolized by the educated classes, and this monopoly would be broken down by nationalizing existing public educational funds so that all may have an equal share in them. The money necessary for these reforms is to be supplied by taxing inheritances.

Prof. Graham further assumes that Government now works successfully, from the economical point of view, the postal and telegraph services. He would do well to read two of Jevons's essays, one written before, the other after, the acquisition of the telegraphs by the British Government. Prof. Graham again declares that the management of railways is work "not demanding from the general managers the complicated calculations and resources required in manufacturing industry, and for which work, however responsible or difficult, the Government could secure as capable managers as the companies." This proposition may be commended to the directors, say, of the Pennsylvania Railroad. It is certainly doubtful if such a body as the New York Legislature, or even the American Congress, would manage our railroad system with satisfactory results. But it might be otherwise in Prof. Graham's commonwealth, for he lays it down that "the officials under Socialism would be the most capable in the nation."

As to the wages-fund theory, Prof. Graham considers that it is entirely exploded. Singularly enough, when he undertakes to state what determines the rate of wages, he declares that it depends chiefly upon the ratio between the number of laborers and the demand, the "amount of need" for their services. Unless this is intended to express the absurdity of a ratio between a number and an abstraction, it must mean that the "amount of need" is measured in material quantity. As to the explosion of the wages-fund theory, which so many writers upon these subjects regard as unquestioned, it may be worth while to say that the essential element in that theory is simply the truth that wages paid for any piece of work are necessarily paid out of wealth produced before that work is done. In other words, the laborer's subsistence must be provided beforehand in order that he may work—a theory which will perhaps be exploded when the theory of gravity is abandoned.

As we should expect, Prof. Graham attributes the improvement in the condition of working-people in England to the Government inspectors. Had it not been for them,

"we should have a proletariat of servile workers, degraded in physique, in mind, in morals; mothers working in mines and factories, their sickly children dying without a mother's care, or surviving with enfeebled frames; other children ignorant and savage, worked to death or growing up savages; the whole laboring population turned into mere human plant and instruments to make the fortunes of masters constantly becoming more insolent and inhuman from immunity. We should have had the 'slave-gangs' of the Roman Republic repeated," etc.

We commend these views to the consideration of the protectionists who have been annoyed

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by persistent assertions that the improved condition of the working-classes in England was due to free trade.

Obviously Prof. Graham is not a person to shrink from drawing an indictment against a whole nation. The rich as a class, whether intentionally or not, have injured the poor, and as a class they must disgorge some of their wealth. They must do it because it is just, of course, but they will have to do it, whether or no. If they are wise, they will submit to a moderate amercement at once, because the craving for "justice" among the poor may become so strong if it is not gratified in this way, that nothing less than general confiscation will satisfy their consciences. Like the children of Israel, they will feel that the despoiling of their masters shall be counted to them for righteousness by the Almighty. Perhaps a later comparison would be more fitting, for Prof. Graham soberly declares that a city where pauperism was stamped out would be "the true Holy City, and the Kingdom of Heaven will have come nigh unto it.' Clearly the Mohammedan paradise is before us, with material gratifications unthought of by the Prophet.

It is strange that writers of this stamp, whose name is legion, should so completely ignore the enormous extent to which laborers have become capitalists. Their savings constitute an important element in almost all modern enterprises, and schemes directed against "the capitalist" in the abstract inevitably recoil against the laborer in the concrete. We must, of course, credit the victims of the modern socialistic craze with sincerity in their plans for enriching the poor by impoverishing the rich, but their view is mysteriously limited. In the case of the present writer, while we are unable to put a high estimate upon his wisdom, we may at least say that his tone is comparatively moderate, and many of his observations judicious. His remarks upon the probable increase of selfishness in the modern world are especially suggestive.

Eclectic Card Catalog Rules, Author and Title Entries; based on Dziatzko's 'Instruction' compared with other authorities. By Klas August Linderfelt. Boston: Charles A. Cutter. 1890. Pp. viii, 104. 8vo.

WHILE Prof. Carl Dziatzko, now of Göttingen, was Librarian of the University of Breslau, he caused to be made, as a complement to the classified-subject catalogue which the library already possessed, an alphabetical card catalogue of authors. During the process of cataloguing, more than 330,000 volumes, with the corresponding cards, passed for inspection through his hands, and on the wide experience thus gained he based his 'Instruction für die Ordnung der Titel im alphabetischen Zettelkatalog der Königlichen und Universitäts-Bibliothek zu Breslau' (Berlin: Asher, 1886). These rules Mr. Linderfelt justly describes as "a model of ingenious condensation, lucidity, and completeness. It would have been impossible to evolve out of mere theoretical reasoning such an array of minute directions as to the manner of proceeding in the innumerable variations and peculiarities of book-making, which are the result of the vagaries of authors, publishers, and printers of the last 450 years, and now contribute their share towards making the life of the conscientious cataloger a burden." Mr. Linderfelt's book, which is rather an adaptation than a translation of Dziatzko's, preserves the general spirit and intricate, but economical, schematism of the original, while it so modifies individual rules as to conform them to prevalent American methods of cataloguing. In addition, Mr. Linderfelt has examined the rules of the British Museum and the Bodleian Libraries, of the American and the British Library Associations, of Cutter, Dewey, Jewett, and Perkins, and has noted at each point which of these authorities do, and which do not, agree with the "eclectic" rules.

The title which Mr. Linderfelt has chosen is more attractive than Prof. Dziatzko's, but by no means so accurate. The 'Eclectic Card Catalog Rules' are not catalogue rules at all. From them the would-be cataloguer can infer, no doubt, that books of known authorship sometimes have titles, but whether or not the titles should form any part of his catalogue he cannot even infer. Place of publication, date of issue, size, number of pages, will not be mentioned in it—at least they are not mentioned in the rules. In short, the most intelligent use of these rules would not enable a person without previous knowledge of cataloguing to catalogue the simplest book. The 'Eclectic Rules' take for granted that a complete description of the book in question—title, edition, imprint, contents, and notes—is already at hand; they then point out how to choose from this material the heading or rubric ("entry word," Mr. Linderfelt well calls it) under which the description is to appear, how to alphabetize the rubrics chosen, how to make some cross-references. These three accomplishments are far from being all there is of book-cataloguing. Still, they are an important part of it, and Mr. Linderfelt's treatment of them is the most careful and rational that we have seen.

The 'Eclectic Rules,' of course, are in general similar to those of the 'Instruction,' but not always identical with them. Prof. Dziatzko, in common with other German bibliographers, chooses the first substantive not in a grammatically subordinate position as entry word for an anonymous book-title—he enters the *Saturday Review*, for example, under "Review." Moreover, he considers the publications of learned academies and societies anonymous: he enters the volumes published by the Chetham Society under "Remains historical and literary connected with the Palatine Counties." Mr. Linderfelt has so shaped his rules as to secure entry, in the cases mentioned, under "Saturday" and "Chetham." He was, consequently, obliged to attempt a solution of the vexed question, How shall societies and academies be entered? He adopted the fifth, and best, of the plans mentioned in Cutter's 'Rules for a Dictionary Catalogue,' making but one change, and no improvement, therein. According to the 'Eclectic Rules,' "when the legal name of an institution includes a full personal name, it is entered in the usual order of the name, as *Enoch* Pratt Free Library, with a cross-reference under Pratt." "The usual order of the name" has a plausible sound, but Mr. Linderfelt seems momentarily to have forgotten a fact which Mr. Cutter realizes, viz., that in a catalogue "the usual order of the name" is the inverted order. The cataloguer should write "Pratt (Enoch) Free Library."

One other alteration, this time of the German rules, does not seem to us fortunate. It advises that when a book is published under initials whose meaning remains unknown, the rubric be the last initial instead of the first word of the title. This suggestion, though supported by the practice of many good libraries, both in the United States and in England, is an extreme and unwarranted application of the author-entry idea. In fact, a chief weakness of American book-cataloguing has long been the tendency, now happily vanishing from the treatment of anonymous and pseudonymous books, to seize, at whatever inconvenience to the reader, upon an author-entry or anything that resembles an author-entry. Now, the sole object of cataloguing a book under its author, or under anything else, is to facilitate the finding of it. Mr. Linderfelt himself admits that Prof. Dziatzko is right in considering the initials "of very little use in finding a certain book," but gives another reason for entering under them. This plan, he says, "has the advantage of collecting all the books by one author in the same place when he persistently uses the same initials." What may be this "advantage of collecting all the books by the same author in one place" when you are not sure who he is, and consequently cannot be sure that he is the same author, we are puzzled to understand. However, a few blemishes like these cannot hide the real excellence of the book. In its first half, the part, that is, which explains the selection of the main entry word, almost every paragraph, with the exception of the rules above mentioned, is deserving of praise.

To the second half of the rules, the instructions for the alphabetical arrangement of the titles, almost no exception can be taken. They are minute and excellent. Substantially the system of transliteration advocated in these columns by the late Michael Heilprin and approved at the Lake George Conference of the Library Association, is adopted in the 'Eclectic Rules.' "For the purpose of producing transliterated forms more in harmony with those in ordinary use," Mr. Linderfelt has introduced a few modifications, most of which, unfortunately, look towards the forms that were familiar in the last decade, rather than towards those which bid fair to be familiar in the next. For ancient Greek names, on the other hand, he prefers the newly advocated "Greek forms" (Aischylos, Kimôn) instead of the familiar Latin forms, and similarly he writes names of foreign towns and sovereigns in their vernacular instead of their English forms. The rules are followed by an appendix containing a list of Oriental titles and occupations, with their usual and their correct transliterations, and their significations. This list, which contains more than 600 titles, will be very useful to cataloguers who are ignorant of Oriental languages and consequently apt to mistake such titles for parts of the author's name.

The 'Rules' are accurately printed, the examples are abundant and in general well chosen, and the index is much fuller than that of the German original. In a fairly close examination of the book we have discovered but one joke (§ 174): "It may be stated on the authority of R. B. Wheatley, that dissertation, disputatio, thesis, etc. [!], are generally used synonymously."

Kleinere Schriften, gedruckte und ungedruckte, von Joh. Jos. Ign. v. Döllinger. Gesammelt und herausgegeben von F. H. Reusch. Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta. 1890. Pp. vi., 608.

THE contents of this stout octavo volume consist of addresses delivered and articles written from 1848 to 1853, and again from 1863 to 1878, and cover two important periods of the author's literary activity and intellectual development. The topics discussed in the papers belonging to the earlier period are such as then constituted the burning questions of the day, and refer chiefly to the relations of Church and State, which, Dr. Döllinger maintained, should be wholly independent of each other. As a mem-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ber of the Frankfort Parliament of 1848, he urged this view with eloquence and earnestness, and endeavored to embody it in national legislation. He heartily endorsed the article in the proposed German Constitution which secured to every citizen perfect freedom of religious opinion and worship, and placed all churches and confessions in a position of complete equality before the law; but he deemed the independence of Church and State absolutely essential to the full effectuation of this principle of liberty, and his pamphlet on this subject, published anonymously in August, 1848, forms the initial paper of the present volume. It is also interesting to note his opinions incidentally expressed in this connection concerning the office and power of the Pope within the hierarchy. Döllinger denied that the head of the Church was, in any proper sense of the term, sovereign, or that his authority had ever been regarded as absolute or infallible. He declared that in no State on earth, except perhaps in China, is the supreme ruler subject to so many strict limitations and legal conditions in the exercise of his functions as in the Catholic Church; indeed, so completely is he hemmed in on all sides by precedents, traditions, and the decrees of councils, and so little room is there left for the assertion of personal sentiments, that any one familiar with canon law and Catholic theology can predict with certainty, in forty-nine cases out of fifty, precisely what the Pope's decision will be. This was Döllinger's firm conviction, repeatedly uttered and emphasized, and shows how impossible it was for him to accept the Vatican dogma of 1870 and to preserve his self-consistency and self-respect as a man and a scholar.

The proclamation of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception in 1854, and the issue of the encyclical letter of 1864, with its notorious syllabus, ought to have opened his eyes to the direction in which the tide was setting and the ark of the Church was drifting. That he saw the danger is evident from the paper entitled "Die Speyerische Seminarfrage und der Syllabus," written in January, 1866, and now first printed from the original manuscript. Here he perceives and defines very clearly the aims of Ultramontanism, which were to make the Pope the supreme, infallible, and, therefore, sole authority in all that pertains, not only to religion and the Church, but also to the State, science, politics, morals, social conditions—in short, the whole intellectual life of individuals and nations—and to insist upon the recognition of these claims as the test of Catholicity. At that time, however, Döllinger could not bring himself to believe that such short-sighted and reckless pilots had really got control of the ship and would keep permanent possession of the rudder. All Ultramontanists, he says, are at heart foes to history and to historical research, for they know that the results of calm and profound investigations are fatal to their system. Occasionally they may portray the life of a single individual or depict an isolated event or epoch in a partisan and polemical spirit, but no Ultramontanist has ever written a connected and pragmatic history.

"The only noteworthy attempt that has ever been made to treat a whole section of universal history in a Romanistic sense and in accordance with the wishes of the Ultramontane party is Damberger's 'Synchronistic History of the Middle Ages,' in which the author, following in the footsteps of his fellow-Jesuit Hardouin, sets aside as forged or false whatever is opposed to the Jesuitical system."

Besides the discussion of the Syllabus, just mentioned, two other contributions to the present volume, namely, the "Geschichtliche Uebersicht des Konzils von Trient" (written in 1866) and "Pius IX" (begun in 1878, but unfortunately never finished) are here published for the first time. The biography sketches the career of the late Pontiff till about the year 1854, and is in every respect an admirable study of character and a model of clear and condensed narration. Nowhere else is to be found such a faithful and vivid portraiture of the ninth Pius and the first of infallible popes as in this fragment of less than fifty pages. The liberal movement which he inaugurated, the weakness and vanity which rendered the reform a farce, the reaction which followed his return from Gaeta, where he had become a mere tool in the hard hands of Antonelli, and which Massimo d'Azeglio tersely and truly summed up as "priestly vengeance (*vendetta pretina*) in its ugliest form," are all described in a succinct and masterly manner.

According to Dr. Döllinger, Pius IX. had neither literary talent nor artistic taste, and his lack of juristic training, as well as of a judicial mind, prevented him from taking any initiatory or even intelligent part in public affairs. He seldom read anything except his breviary and the *Civiltà Cattolica*, and one had frequent occasion to remark that his opinion on any subject was that of the last person with whom he had chanced to speak. He was fond of cheerful conversation and felt the need of congenial companionship, which he found in a narrow circle of prelates whose ideas, interests, and aspirations all centred in schemes for the extension and consolidation of the hierarchy. His utterances were almost always trite and often trivial, and never revealed any depth of thought, but he combined with an easy fluency of speech the kaleidoscopic gift, so common to shallow and undisciplined minds, of presenting the same theme in endless variations. He was always ready with apt tropes, witty comparisons, and more or less pertinent passages from the Bible, with which he interlarded his already rather unctuous discourse; for his foes and those who had fallen out of favor he had a quiver full of epigrams, ironical retorts, derisive taunts, and sarcastic similes. He was a stately and handsome man, with a rich and melodious voice. His native affability and benignant look, and the blending of conscious dignity and kindly condescension in his manner, fascinated all whom he received. Women thronged to his audiences and were powerfully affected by his presence, which threw them into a sort of rapture, sometimes rising to ecstatic paroxysm. In speaking to priests and nuns he fell into a fatherly and confidential tone which was very becoming to him. But with all his good nature, he readily took offence, and was incalculably capricious; his favor and confidence could be won or lost by the slightest accidental circumstance, and no one was perfectly sure of them, except Antonelli and his Jesuit father confessor. In the latter he put implicit trust, and in most matters accepted the views of this crafty functionary as decisive.

No Pope was ever so fulsomely flattered as he, and his capacity of absorbing and assimilating adulation seemed practically unlimited. Indeed, only a character of rare strength and elevation could have resisted these influences and kept his faculties from being befogged and benumbed by the thick cloud of incense that constantly surrounded him. "Only by a miracle of divine grace can a Pope remain humble," remarks Maffei in his 'Vita di Pio V.'; "with the ninth Pius," adds Döllinger, "the miracle would have to have been ten times greater than with the fifth." He was told that he was "the adored darling of mankind"; that he was not merely a vicegerent of God, as other popes had been, but a divinely commissioned saviour and reformer of the world, whose salvation or destruction depended upon him; he was assured by Bishop Plantier of Nîmes that as king he stood high above all monarchs of his time; and Bishop Rodez fairly raved about the "entrancing and superhuman beauty of his countenance." The priest Alcyoni published an elaborate parallel between him and the Virgin Mary in thirty-one articles ('Le Rosier de Marie,' Paris, 1862); in Utrecht his portrait was worshipped as an altar-picture; and in 1867 it was reported from Paris that miracles had been wrought by tatters of one of his cast-off sacerdotal robes. When the floor of the Church of Sant' Agnese broke through and the Pope and his attendants were uninjured, he was told that angels had borne him up; and a storm which shattered some windows in the Vatican, but spared his private apartment, was represented as an assault of the prince of the power of the air, from which he had been shielded by direct divine interposition. This belief in his immunity rendered him also fearless in good works and in doing his duty: he visited the French hospital in Rome and comforted the cholera patients, firmly persuaded that the devil could do him no harm, even when incarnate in the insidious form of a microbe or comma-bacillus.

But our space forbids us to dwell upon the many fine features and striking points of psychological analysis presented in this biographical essay. Other articles of special interest are: "The Past and Present of Catholic Theology," "The Doctrine of Papal Infallibility since the Sixteenth Century," "The Vatican Dogma," two papers on the Inquisition, and a lengthy disquisition on mediæval and modern prophets and prophecies entitled, "Der Weissagungsglaube und das Prophetentum in der christlichen Zeit." The volume is carefully edited by Prof. Reusch, whose scholarly annotations greatly enhance its intrinsic value.

A History of Rome. [Ancient History for Colleges and High Schools. By P. V. N. Myers. Part II.] Boston: Ginn & Co. 1890. Pp. x, 230.

THIS manual history of Rome is a revision of a former work of the author, published with the 'History of Greece and the Eastern Nations.' The maps and most of the cuts which it contains are the same as those in the Roman History of the late lamented William F. Allen, and were furnished by his widow. The book appears to be a good and handy school history, telling what a teacher really should require his pupils to learn in one of the most perplexing subjects in a school course. Prof. Myers of course adopts the prevailing views as to the real character of early Roman history, but he does not on that account banish the legends of the regal period. These legends were what passed for Roman history with Virgil and Cæsar, and if boys are to read Virgil and Cæsar understandingly, they must know what those men supposed to be the origins of their history. After all, when the legends, with their absurdities and inconsistencies, are swept away, we have no real history to put in their place. What Mommsen or Ihne substitutes is an invention, or at best an inference, though it may be a reasonable and probable one. But to read some manuals of history written by devotees of the former, one would imagine that he had dug up from the ruins of Rome contemporary inscriptions giving the true account of the curiæ and the tribes. Mr. Myers has very judiciously given most of the celebrated legends of the regal period in a chapter

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

supplementary to that containing what he holds to be the most probable view of that period. In the later chapters, the story of the great republican wars, the contests for supremacy in its last century, and the whole of the Empire down to Odoacer is told with much conciseness and liveliness. While one is glad to see the absurd practice of terminating with Commodus, or still worse with Augustus, abandoned, it still seems that the period of the later Republic, and especially the time of the Gracchi, is condensed out of all proportion to the wars of Honorius and Alaric in the end of the book. The questions of antiquities, administration, private life, literature, etc., are transferred to a separate division after the events are concluded; this is a decided improvement for purposes of instruction.

The philosophy of the book appears to us very sound; the author has not allowed himself to have his judgment of great characters perverted by the Cæsarism of Mommsen, or what one might almost designate the profligate views of Prof. Beesly. We can hardly speak as favorably of his style. There is a tendency here and there to the florid, which may answer before enthusiastic pupils in the lecture-room but is only frigid on the printed page. The term "Acropolis of Italy" (p. 58) is a very uncouth transfer from Polybius; and a comparison to a modern writer which has been introduced in the account of Cicero (p. 203), is in the worst taste. Besides points of style we have found little to censure. A scholar writing a history of Rome should be ashamed of the modern corruption *rostrum*, and of saying, "so called because decorated with the beaks (*rostra*) of war galleys." Prof. Myers must know that the Romans themselves never called the stand or desk anything but *rostra*, whatever Americans may call a pulpit or platform. The same correct principle which admitted the regal legends as legends should have given the stories of Valerius Corvus, the Decii, and the Torquati. Pyrrhus's second victory should be named (p. 40). If Milton is to be quoted apropos of Moloch (p. 42), let him be quoted right. There seems no reason for adopting the Greek form Barcas (p. 50), certainly not Roman, and not probably Punic. The Consul Sempronius is Tiberius, not Lucius (p. 59). We should like to have a quotation from the ancient poet who called Corinth the "eye of Hellas" (p. 72). The use of awnings (p. 109) is mentioned by Lucretius long before Cæsar's exhibitions, contrary to the quotation from Gibbon. Surely the "Fulminata Legio" had received that name long before the supposed Christian miracle (p. 141). But serious mistakes are conspicuously absent.

Peintures de Vases Antiques recueillies par Millin (1808) et Millingen (1813). Publiées et commentées par Salomon Reinach. Paris: Firmin-Didot et Cie. 1891. Small 4to, pp. xv and 136, with 31 plates.

By this book M. Reinach has well earned the gratitude of students of Greek vases, first for having reduced into one compact volume all that is of permanent value in the three great folios of Millin and Millingen, thereby increasing their convenience in the same ratio that the cost has been diminished; and second, for having modernized both works by revising the interpretations of the illustrations in accordance with the methods and knowledge of the present day, and also noting all that he has been able to gather of the history of each specimen during the eighty years that have elapsed since the original publication. The amount of thankless drudgery involved in this part of his task only those who have undertaken similar labors can estimate or appreciate, and we congratulate him upon the result, for while it was inevitable that some of the vases published should have disappeared in this long interval, the number that have escaped M. Reinach's vigilance seems to us surprisingly small.

The reduction of the plates has been successfully accomplished, and it is safe to say that nothing but the luxury of the originals is lost to the student. Millingen's work, both in text and drawings, was much more accurate than Millin's. A careful draughtsman, he was thoroughly in sympathy with the kind of art he reproduced, and in the types of faces, as also in the least important details, he showed a scientific exactness which was in advance of his generation; whereas Clener, who made the drawings for Millin, was, as M. Reinach says, willingly inexact. His aim, like that of most draughtsmen of the time, was to make his work artistic at any cost, and to that end he was willing to improve upon his models when he thought it necessary, as, for example, "Par un singulier phénomène d'influence, beaucoup de têtes viriles ont pris un profil napoléonien." Yet, in spite of the looseness of the drawing and the mystical character of the interpretations, which, in the spirit of the archæological commentary at the beginning of this century, could see nothing commonplace in the most commonplace gestures and attitudes, and discovered gods and goddesses in the youths and maidens represented in their daily pursuits and pastimes—in spite of such shortcomings, we think M. Reinach quite right in insisting upon the importance of Millin's book, and the desirability of reproducing it with modern criticisms and corrections; and in his edition it will certainly be what he considers the original—"un ouvrage fondamental, indispensable pour l'étude de la céramique."

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

A Few Words on Robert Browning. Philadelphia: Arnold & Co.
An Unvested Sister: Recollections of Mary Wiltse. James Pott & Co.
Bacon, Alice. Japanese Girls and Women. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.25.
Bogardus, Capt. Field, Cover, and Trap Shooting. *Forest and Stream* Publishing Co. $2.
Brewer, Rev. E. C. The Historic Note-Book. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. $3.50.
Briggs, L. B. R. Original Charades. Charles Scribner's Sons. $1.
Burr, E. F. Aleph, the Chaldean. Wilbur B. Ketcham. $1.75.
Butler, Agnata F. Herodotus VII. Macmillan & Co. 50 cents.
Chaffee, F. Songs of Spring. Illustrated. New York: Geo. M. Allen & Co. $2.
Comegys, B. B. A Primer of Ethics. Boston: Ginn & Co. 50 cents.
Daniels, Cora. Sardia. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 50 cents.
Dawson, W. German Socialism and Ferdinand Lassalle. 2d ed. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.
Delitzsch, F. Behold the Man. Thomas Whittaker. 50 cents.
Delpit, A. Such is Life. Chicago: Laird & Lee.
Dickinson, Mary L. The Living Christ. Fleming H. Revell Co.
Dietz, W. The Soldier's First Handbook. John Wiley & Sons.
Diniz, Julio. The Fidalgos of Casa Mourisca. Boston: D. Lothrop Co. $1.50.
Dowsett, C. F. Striking Events in Irish History. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. $1.
Drummond, H. Tropical Africa. 4th ed. Scribner & Welford. $1.
Dunbar, C. Chapters on the Theory and History of Banking. G. P. Putnam's Sons.
Duncan, Sara. An American Girl in London. D. Appleton & Co. $1.50.
Eggleston, G., and Dolores Marbourg. Juggernaut. Fords, Howard and Hulbert. $1.25.
Falconer, L. Mademoiselle Ixe. Cassell Publishing Co. 50 cents.
Fenn, G. M. A Double Knot. United States Book Co. 50 cents.
Fenn, G. M. A Mint of Money. United States Book Co. 50 cents.
Fraser, A. Selections from Berkeley. 4th ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press: New York: Macmillan. $2.10.
Gage, A. P. Physical Laboratory Manual and Note Book. Boston: Ginn & Co. 45 cents.
Garden and Forest. Vol. III. New York: Garden and Forest Publishing Co.
Gentlemen. Brentanos. $1.50.
Genung, J. The Epic of the Inner Life. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.25.
Gordon, A. J. The First Thing in the World. Fleming H. Revell Co. 20 cents.
Grandgent, C. H. Materials for French Composition. Part I. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.
Habberton, J. Mrs. Mayburn's Twins. Philadelphia: T. B. Peterson & Bros. 25 cents.
Harrison, Elizabeth. A Study of Child-Nature. Chicago: The Chicago Kindergarten Training School.
Harte, B. A Sappho of Green Springs, and Other Stories. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.25.
Hastings, G. Philip Hensen. Edward Brandus & Co. 50 cents.
History of St. Georges's Parish. Richmond, Va.: J. W. Randolph & English.
Holland, Rev. F. M. Frederick Douglass, the Colored Orator. Funk & Wagnalls.
Houdard, A. Premiers Principes de l'Economique. Paris: Guillaumin & Cie.
Hutchinson, Rev. H. N. The Autobiography of the Earth. D. Appleton & Co. $1.50.
Japp, A. H. De Quincey Memorials. 2 vols. U. S. Book Co.
Johnston, R. The Primes and Their Neighbors. D. Appleton & Co. $1.25.
Jones-Foster, A. Day Dreams. Imperial Publishing Co.
Keltie, J. S. The Statesman's Year-Book. Macmillan & Co.
Kenyon, F. G. Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens. Longmans, Green & Co.
Kluge, F. An Etymological Dictionary of the German Language. London: G. Bell & Sons; New York: Macmillan & Co.
Lamb, Charles & Mary. Tales from Shakespeare's Tragedies. Edited with notes by W. J. Rolfe. Harper & Bros.
Lang, A. Essays in Little. Charles Scribner's Sons. $1.
Larcom, Lucy. As It Is In Heaven. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.
Leland, C. A Manual of Wood-Carving. Charles Scribner's Sons. $1.75.
Lock, Rev. J. B. Arithmetic for Schools. Macmillan & Co. 70 cents.
Lord, J. K. Livy, Books XXI. and XXII., with introduction and maps. Leach, Shewell & Sanborn.
Lucas, F. W. Appendiculæ Historicæ: or, Shreds of History Hung on a Horn. London: Henry Stevens & Son.
Lumby, Rev. J. R. The First Book of Kings, with Map, Introduction and Notes. Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan.
Magnusson, E., and Others. National Life and Thought. The Frederick A. Stokes Co. $3.
Merlitt, E. A Brave Woman. Worthington Co.
Mathers, Helen. The Mystery of No. 13. United States Book Co. 25 cents.
Matthews, B. French Dramatists of the 19th Century. 2d ed. Charles Scribner's Sons. $1.50.
May, Ansley. So Runs the World Away. G. W. Dillingham.
May, J. W. The Law of Life Insurance. 3d ed. 2 vols. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. $11.
McCarthy, J. Sir Robert Peel. Harper & Bros.
McGuinness. Rhode Island Manual. Providence: E. L. Freeman & Son.
Merivale, H., and F. T. Marzials. Life of W. M. Thackeray. London: Walter Scott; New York: A. Lovell & Co. 40 cents.
Morgan, C. L. Animal Life and Intelligence. Boston: Ginn & Co. $4.
Moore, A. L. Some Aspects of Sin. London: Percival & Co.
Morrison, W. Crime and Its Causes. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.
Munro, Kirk. Campmates. Harper & Bros.
Oman, C. Warwick. Macmillan & Co. 60 cents.
O'Reilly, P. J. At Ober-Ammergau in 1890. London: The Catholic Truth Society; New York: Benziger Brothers.
Overton, J. John Wesley. London: Methuen & Co.
Pater, W. Marius the Epicurean. 5th thousand. Macmillan & Co. $2.25.
Peabody, Rev. A. King's Chapel Sermons. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.50.
Perry, T. S. Marie Louise and the Invasion of 1814. Charles Scribner's Sons. $1.25.
Peterson's National Cook Book. Philadelphia: T. B. Peterson & Bros. 25 cents.
Plummer, Rev. A. St. James and St. Jude. [The Expositor's Bible.] A. C. Armstrong & Son. $1.50.
Pole, Dr. W. The Handbook of Games. 2 vols. Scribner & Welford. $1.40.
Porter, Rose. Cathedral Echoes. Fleming H. Revell Co.
Porter, Rose. Easter Interpreted: Citations from Robert Browning. Fleming H. Revell Co. 20 cents.
Robinson, A. Mary. Lyrics (Selected). Frederick A. Stokes Co. $1.50.
Roche, J. J. Life of John Boyle O'Reilly. Cassell Publishing Co. $3.
Ryan, Marah E. Told in the Hills. Chicago: Rand, McNally & Co. 50 cents.
Salmon, D. Primary School Grammar. Longmans, Green & Co. 35 cents.
Schiller, J. C. F. von. Der Geisterseher. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.
Schreiner, Olive. Dreams. Chicago: Chas. H. Sergel & Co.
Schubin, O. Boris Lensky. Worthington Co.
Sergeant, Lewis. The Government Handbook. The Frederick A. Stokes Co. $2.50.
Seton-Karr, W. S. The Marquess Cornwallis. Macmillan & Co. 60 cents.
Sheldon, Grace. As We Saw It in '90. Buffalo: The Woman's Exchange.
Sherman, P. A Tariff Primer. G. P. Putnam's Sons.
Shoup, F. Mechanism and Personality. Boston: Ginn & Co. $1.30.
Sloane, T. O'C. Rubber Hand Stamps. Norman W. Henley & Co. $1.
Sonnenschein, E. A. Macci Plavti Rvdens. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan $2.25.
Speight, T. Hoodwinked. Chicago: Rand, McNally & Co.
Spooner, Rev. W. A. The Histories of Tacitus, with introduction, notes, and an index. Macmillan & Co. $3.50.
Steveus's Facsimiles of MSS. in European Archives relating to America, 1773–83. Vol. VII. London: B. F. Stevens.
Stevens, F. G. A Memoir of George Cruikshank. Scribner & Welford. $1.25.
Storm, T. Immensee. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.
Strauss, H. W. King-Riding. D. Appleton & Co.
Taylor, Belle. The Sardonyx Seal. G. P. Putnam's Sons.
Teall, F. H. The Compounding of English Words. John Ireland. $1.25.
Teuffel's History of Roman Literature. Vol. I. The Republican Period. London: Geo. Bell & Sons. $5.
The Club Cook Book. Newton, Mass.: The Young Ladies' McAll Club.
Yeats, W. B. Representative Irish Tales. 2 vols. G. P. Putnam's Sons. $2.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED